

# The Southern Speech Journal

VOLUME XVI

MAY, 1951

NUMBER 4

## ABRAHAM LINCOLN: THE SPEAKER

ROBERT L. KINCAID\*

Abraham Lincoln's claim to greatness lies principally in his statesmanship in a critical period in the life of our nation. In analyzing that greatness, it is easy to break it down into its component parts and consider different phases of his lasting fame. We often hear much about Lincoln the lawyer, Lincoln the story-teller, Lincoln the humorist, Lincoln the writer, Lincoln the politician, or Lincoln the humanitarian. So it is that many students of this great American have also considered him as one of the great orators of modern times.

It is appropriate for this gathering to discuss Lincoln the speaker. Although he never attended college a day in his life, or, so far as we know, took a single lesson in elocution, he attained such distinction as a speaker during his public career, he could most worthily have become a member of the Tau Kappa Alpha.

In considering Lincoln's forensic abilities, we find a difference of opinion among many students of his career. Lord Curzon, in a course of lectures at the University of Cambridge in 1913, stated that the three masterpieces of modern oratory in the English language were the toast of William Pitt after Trafalgar, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, and Lincoln's Second Inaugural. William Jennings Bryan in his eulogy of Lincoln in 1909 rated the Great Emancipator as one of the outstanding orators in American history. Yet, others claim that Lincoln was an inferior performer on the platform. It was granted that he could make an effective stump speech and could present impressive, logical arguments that commanded attention, but as a finished orator, many students have felt he was a second rate figure. This, of course, does not take into account the fact that his major

---

\*President, Lincoln Memorial University. This paper was presented at the convention dinner of the eleventh annual Tau Kappa Alpha convention, Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate, Tennessee, March 16, 1951.

speeches during the later years of his life are now recognized at literary masterpieces.

This difference of opinion as to Lincoln's ability as an orator probably stems from the fact that he was tall, ungainly, awkward, and spoke with a rather high-pitched voice. It has been said that he often began his speeches with apparent reserve and shyness, that his gestures were not polished, and that his voice was not too pleasing. However, when he warmed to his subject he was usually able to work his hearers into a fervor of enthusiasm. Lincoln may not have had the fire of a Patrick Henry; he may not have spoken with the rolling cadences of a Daniel Webster, the impassioned eloquence of a Henry Clay, the poetic beauty of Robert G. Ingersoll, or the magnificent flourishes of a William Jennings Bryan; but it must be granted that he had tremendous power as a speaker and his spoken words produced a lasting effect upon his audience, which, after all, is the mark of the great orator.

John G. Nicolay, one of Lincoln's secretaries, made this appraisal of Lincoln's power as a speaker:

He talks fluently, uses good strong Saxon, and avoids all attempts at display and affectations of any kind. His voice is strong and clear, and his articulation is singularly perfect.

Robert G. Ingersoll had this to say of Lincoln:

If you wish to know the difference between an orator and an elocutionist — between what is felt and what is said — between what the heart and brain can do together and what the brain can do alone — read Lincoln's wondrous words at Gettysburg, and then the speech of Edward Everett. The oration of Lincoln will never be forgotten. It will live until languages are dead and lips are dust. The speech of Everett will never be read. The elocutionists believe in the virtue of voice, the sublimity of syntax, the majesty of long sentences, and the genius of gesture. The orator loves the real, the simple, the natural. He places the thought above all.

What were the secrets of this forensic ability of Abraham Lincoln? I do not believe that it was the magnetism of the born orator, as we think of natural oratory. He did not make a commanding and impressive physical appearance which over-powered his listeners by

the sheer force of his personality. A writer in 1861 gave this description of the man who was entering the White House:

To say he is ugly is nothing; to add that his figure is grotesque is to convey no adequate impression. Fancy a man well over six feet high, and thin in proportion, with long bony arms and legs which somehow always seem to be in the way; with great rugged furrowed hands, which grasp you like a vise when shaking yours; with a long, scraggy neck, and a chest too narrow for the great arms at his side. Add to this figure a head, cocoanut shaped and somewhat too small for such a stature, covered with rough, uncombed hair that stands out in every direction at once; a face furrowed, wrinkled, and indented as though it had been scarred by vitriol; a high, narrow forehead, sunk beneath bushy eyebrows; two bright, somewhat dreamy eyes that seem to gaze through you without looking at you; . . . a close-set, thin-lipped stern mouth, with two rows of large white teeth, and a nose and ears which have been taken by mistake from a head twice the size. Clothe this figure, then, in a long, tight, badly-fitting suit of black. . . . Add to all this an air of strength, physical as well as moral, and a strange look of dignity . . . and you have the impression left on me by Abraham Lincoln.

So it seems to me in thinking of Lincoln as an orator, it was not *how* Lincoln spoke, but *what* he said and the measured beauty of his phrases which made him a power on the platform. We who try to develop effective public speech should be able to get some valuable lessons from this self-trained oratorical genius.

Lincoln's development as a youth was much like that of any frontier lad. He attended the public schools less than a year in his life, and his education, which he listed as "defective" in the Congressional Directory of 1846, was that which he received from his own extensive reading. He mastered a number of books during his boyhood. He read the Bible, Shakespeare, "Pilgrim's Progress," The Statutes of Indiana, Weems' "Life of Washington," Aesop's Fables, and other biographies and textbooks which he was able to borrow from neighbors.

Whether he aspired to be a public speaker while he was growing up is not known. It is believed, however, that on the wilderness frontier in Indiana during his teen-age period, he memorized poems and extracts from public speeches, which he probably declaimed in the Indiana woods. There is no evidence of his having made a public

speech prior to the time he was a candidate for the Illinois Legislature in 1832. We have what is believed to be the text of that first speech when he offered himself for public office. It was not unlike that of any other youthful speech which might have been made by any young man of 23, and certainly in it we can see no evidence of greatness which he would attain. Here is what he said:

Fellow Citizens, I presume you all know who I am—I am humble Abraham Lincoln. I have been solicited by many friends to become a candidate for the Legislature. My politics are short and sweet, like the old woman's dance. I am in favor of a national bank. I am in favor of the internal improvement system and a high protective tariff. These are my sentiments and political principles. If elected I shall be thankful; if not it will be all the same.

That was Abraham Lincoln at the age of 23. Would you give him "A" for "effort?"

Let us see his development in the next six years. Lincoln had gained some experience in the Illinois Legislature and had been admitted to the Illinois Bar. Note the maturity and improvement in one of his speeches made when he was 29 years of age:

Let every American, every lover of liberty, every well-wisher to his posterity swear by the blood of the Revolution never to violate in the least particular the laws of the country, and never to tolerate their violation by others. As the patriots of seventy-six did to the support of the Declaration of Independence, so to the support of the Constitution and laws let every American pledge his life, his property, and his sacred honor—let every man remember that to violate the law is to trample on the blood of his father, and to tear the charter of his own and his children's liberty. Let reverence for the laws be breathed by every American mother to the lisping babe that prattles on her lap; let it be taught in schools, in seminaries, and in colleges; let it be written in primers, spelling-books, and in almanacs; let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice. And, in short, let it become the political religion of the nation; and let the old and the young, the rich and the poor, the grave and the gay of all sexes and tongues and colors and conditions, sacrifice unceasingly upon its altars.

An examination of the address from which this extract is taken



reveals a remarkable maturity of thought and is indicative of Lincoln's ability to turn phrases and build to a climax. This early speech may be considered "sophomoric" in performance; however, it indicates his remarkable use of words and his ability to coin polished and balanced phrases. Lincoln as an effective speaker had arrived at the age of 29.

With the delivery of this speech in 1838 begins the decade of Lincoln's emergence as a successful lawyer. Except for his normal activity in the Presidential and local campaign in Illinois, Lincoln's experience as a speaker was in connection with his law practice. He became recognized as an able pleader before juries. He learned all the tricks of the trade in winning cases. He was a superb story-teller and used in his pleadings much of the vernacular and the language of the frontier. He never assumed a pompous attitude but kept his discourse on a common level to appeal to his audiences.

His one term in Congress, from 1846-1848, did not distinguish him as a great speaker in that forum. He made few speeches which attracted attention. But he was particularly adroit in his castigation of General Cass in the Presidential campaign of 1848. He used humor and satire in this major address, which he later felt might have been a little unfair to the General. A portion of this address is indicative of his method of holding a political opponent up to ridicule:

By the way, Mr. Speaker, did you know I am a military hero? Yes, sir; in the days of the Black Hawk war I fought, bled, and came away. Speaking of General Cass's career reminds me of my own. I was not at Stillman's defeat, but I was about as near it as Cass was to Hull's surrender; and, like him, I saw the place very soon afterward. It is quite certain I did not break my sword, for I had none to break; but I bent a musket pretty badly on one occasion. If Cass broke his sword, the idea is he broke it in desperation; I bent the musket by accident. If General Cass went in advance of me in picking huckleberries, I guess I surpassed him in charges upon the wild onions. If he saw any live, fighting Indians, it was more than I did; but I had a good many bloody struggles with the mosquitoes, and although I never fainted from the loss of blood, I can truly say I was often very hungry. Mr. Speaker, if I should ever conclude to doff whatever our Democratic friends may suppose there is of black-cockade federalism about me, and therefore they shall take me up as their candidate for the presidency, I protest they shall not make fun of me, as they have of General Cass, by attempting to write me into a military hero.

This decade of Lincoln's development was not marked by any profound pronouncements on the slavery question, which was so seriously agitating the country at the time. Lincoln's emergence as a great orator dates from 1854, when he made a memorable speech in Peoria, October 6, of that year. This was his first major attack upon the position of Senator Douglas as the leader of the Illinois Democrats.

Lincoln was replying to a speech made previously by Douglas in Springfield, and it pitched the scale of his forensic battle with Douglas, which was to continue through the famous Debates of 1858. This Peoria speech showed the maturity of Lincoln as a political leader and as an impassioned advocate of the final extinction of slavery. The closing paragraph of the speech reveals the lofty attitude of Lincoln in dealing with the slavery problem and in appealing for a new dedication to the spirit of the principles announced in the Declaration of Independence:

Our republican robe is soiled and trailed in the dust. Let us repurify it. Let us turn and wash it white in the spirit, if not the blood of the Revolution. Let us turn slavery from its claims of "moral right" back upon its existing legal rights and its arguments of "necessity." Let us return it to the position our fathers gave it, and there let it rest in peace. Let us readopt the Declaration of Independence, and with it the practices and policy which harmonize with it. Let North and South — let all Americans — let all lovers of liberty everywhere join in the great and good work. If we do this, we shall not only have saved the Union, but we shall have so saved it as to make and to keep it forever worthy of the saving. We shall have so saved it that the succeeding millions of free, happy people, the world over, shall rise up and call us blessed to the latest generation.

You will note a similarity of expression in this portion of his address of 1854 with the extract I quoted from his speech of 1838. Also, the last sentence is but a different expression of the same sentiment which he gave in some of his presidential addresses.

It will not be possible for me to sketch Lincoln's memorable Debates with Douglas in the Illinois Senatorial campaign of 1858. You remember that Lincoln delivered his famous "House Divided" speech at the Republican Convention June 16, 1858, when he became a candidate for the U. S. Senate. His first statement in that address has

often been quoted. Around that statement and Douglas's support of the popular sovereignty principle was the main theme of the seven great Debates which followed. Let us quote that statement:

If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do, and how to do it. We are now far into the fifth year since a policy was initiated with the avowed object and confident promise of putting an end to slavery agitation. Under the operation of that policy, that agitation has not ceased but has constantly augmented. In my opinion, it will not cease until a crisis shall have been reached and passed. 'A house divided against itself cannot stand.' I believe this government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved — I do not expect the house to fall — but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing, or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction; or its advocates will push it forward till it shall become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new, North as well as South.

Professional historians who have made an exhaustive analysis of the Lincoln-Douglas Debates usually arrive at the conclusion that Douglas, with his popular sovereignty principle, was on sound ground from the standpoint of the democratic method of solving a political question; but that Lincoln came out the victor, because he took his position on the high moral principle that human slavery was wrong, should be contained, and ultimately abolished. Although Douglas won the Senatorial race, Lincoln, in his position, became the recognized leader in the West in the moral crusade to abolish slavery. For the first time in his public career, Lincoln had risen to national stature and was ready for the new role he was to play in the Presidential campaign of 1860.

Much has been said about Lincoln's subsequent Cooper Institute speech made in New York City February 27, 1860. It has been ranked as one of his greatest pieces of political argumentation. For the first time he was being heard by important political leaders in the east. They were enthralled by his eloquence, his logic, his sincerity, and his high statesmanship. His speech was a fitting climax to the same solid argument and exalted humanitarian view which he expressed so eloquently in his Debates with Douglas. Just as William

Jennings Bryan in later years won his nomination to the Presidency by his electrifying "Cross of Gold" speech, so this Cooper Institute address brought Lincoln to the Presidency of the United States.

The First and Second Inaugural addresses of Lincoln, his Gettysburg Address, and other important pronouncements made during the Civil War, are so well known it is not necessary to elaborate upon his continued growth as a compelling orator and a master of superb English. These addresses have become part and parcel of the literary heritage of America. They are studied and declaimed in every public school in the land. They are recited by speakers throughout the world in describing the greatness of our democratic heritage. Magnificent in sentiment, poetic in beauty, and immortal in expression, they will endure for all time as the noblest utterances coming from the heart of a great patriot.

I have often wondered if Lincoln's first inaugural address could have been broadcast to the nation, and the Southern people could have felt the warmth and sincerity of his appeal to "the better angels of [their] nature," perhaps the horrors of the Civil War could have been avoided. Listen to his closing remarks in that address:

In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow-countrymen, and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The government will not assail you. You can have no conflict without being yourselves the aggressors. You have no oath registered in heaven to destroy the government, while I shall have the most solemn one to 'preserve, protect, and defend it.'

I am loath to close. We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battle-field and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature.

Lincoln's profound humility was one of his noblest attributes. But he had a clear perspective of the historical importance of the events in which he found himself. His appeal to Congressional leaders on December 1, 1862, is like the voice of our ancient prophet:

Fellow-citizens, we cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one

or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or in dishonor, to the latest generation. We say we are for the Union. The world will not forget that we say this. We know how to save the Union. The world knows we do know how to save it. We — even we here — hold the power and bear the responsibility. In giving freedom to the slave, we assure freedom to the free — honorable alike in what we give and what we preserve. We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last, best hope of earth.

Lincoln gave us in his short second inaugural address an intimate glimpse into his great heart. Victory was near, but there was no exultation, no pride of triumph, no touch of vindictiveness. His closing words set the pattern for all who struggle for freedom and peace.

With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in: to bind up the nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan — to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations.

Why is the Gettysburg Address regarded as one of the greatest addresses of all time? It is not because it is brief. It is not because of its simple, stately, and poetic language. It is rather because it encompasses the universal prayer of mankind for individual liberty. It uses the time and occasion of a critical period in history to proclaim an eternal principle. It is Lincoln at his best in expressing the overpowering passion of his own heart and in giving voice to the common mass of humanity who ever seek to be free. His dedicatory call shall forever ring down through the centuries:

It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us — that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

We began this discussion by talking about "Lincoln the Speaker." How inadequate the term! As we have quoted from his familiar addresses, and have watched the growth of his mind and the unfold-

ing of his devotion to his country, we have become subdued and silent in the presence of his immortal spirit. That is the magic spell of his matchless oratory. That attests the power and greatness of his words. Men live, serve their generations for a few short years, then pass into oblivion. It is the cycle of life for all of us. It is the same with Lincoln. But when his countless monuments in bronze and stone have crumbled away, his words and deeds shall be remembered and cherished by free men "down to the latest generation."

More than a speaker, more than an orator, more than a statesman, more than a prophet, Lincoln is immortal because he gave eloquent expression to the highest ideals of the human heart in seeking to preserve and maintain a government among men which he believed would give to mankind the fullest opportunity for individual growth, happiness, and freedom. That is the greatness of Abraham Lincoln.

## PROJECTIVE TESTS IN PLANNING THERAPY FOR STUTTERERS

JESSE J. VILLARREAL and THOMAS B. BLACKWELL\*

This is a preliminary report of a project now being carried on co-operatively by The University of Texas Speech and Hearing Clinic and The University of Texas Testing and Guidance Bureau to explore the usefulness of projective psychological tests in planning programs of therapy for adult stutterers. Such an exploration seems warranted since stuttering is persistently interpreted as a difficulty involving emotional as well as vocal complications, and since psychological tests of the projective type are designed to provide information regarding the existence and configuration of emotional maladjustment.

For a year and a half, now, adult stutterers entering the University of Texas Speech and Hearing Clinic have been asked to take a battery of psychological projective tests administered by Dr. Blackwell at the Testing and Guidance Bureau. So far, results are available for 17 stutterers. The battery of tests employed has included the Rorschach Inkblot Test, the Draw-a-Person Test, and a word association test for all subjects. The Wechsler-Bellevue Intelligence Scale, Form I has been given all but one of this group; and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory has been given nine of the group.

From the test results, the clinical psychologist has undertaken to provide the speech therapist with a verbal personality profile for each stutterer. The verbal description has been used along with other information gathered through case histories and speech autobiographies in planning a therapy program. The clinical psychologist has further assisted in the therapeutic program by making himself available to the subjects for discussions of the test results, and for psychotherapeutic counselling. Frequent conferences between the clinical psychologist and the speech therapist on individual cases have been utilized to work out ways of keeping the therapy program unified and consistent.

---

\*Professor Villarreal is Associate Professor of Speech and Director, The University of Texas Speech and Hearing Clinic. Professor Blackwell is Clinical Psychologist, The University of Texas Testing and Guidance Bureau.

The speech clinic program for stutterers is built around one individual conference per week for each case, and a weekly group meeting in which all the stutterers participate. The individual meetings make it possible to give attention to the specific difficulties of each case. The group meetings, which are always open to clinical observers and invited guests, are devoted to individual reports, group discussions, questions and answers, informal reviews of the literature on stuttering, guest speakers, and a free give-and-take between members of the group on their individual concerns and difficulties. The persistent aim of both individual and group activities is to help the members of the group to develop insight and objectivity regarding the patterns of social withdrawal and avoidance which their non-fluent speech has caused them to establish, and to develop individual initiative in working out ways of voluntarily altering these restricted, overly protective social patterns.

This bare outline of clinical activities with stutterers, while in no sense a detailed description, may at least serve to indicate a basic point-of-view regarding the therapy of stuttering in which the use of individual psychological tests of the projective type is consistent and important. That point-of-view may be briefly restated as follows: Stuttering is both a speech defect and a speech handicap. It is a speech defect because it is characterized by deviate, non-fluent ways of talking. It is a speech handicap because the stutterer, in his effort to protect himself from the embarrassment and feelings of inferiority that accompany the use of his non-fluent speech, voluntarily imposes upon himself a pattern of withdrawal and nonparticipation in social situations that involve oral communication. And in those situations which cannot be avoided, the stutterer anticipates and dreads the exposure of his inevitably non-fluent speech, so that physical tension and emotional upset are increased, and the use of abnormal secondary symptoms is encouraged.

It follows, if the foregoing description is accepted as the working basis of a program of therapy for stuttering, that the program must concern itself not only with the details of the operation of the stutterers vocal mechanism, but with his characteristic ways of participating in social situations involving oral communication. This amounts to saying that the program of therapy for stutterers is more than a vocal-mechanism centered difficulty, and that it is a personality-centered difficulty as well. For an exploration of the stutterers' person-



ality organization, psychological tests of the projective type would seem to be well-suited. It was this line of thinking that made it seem desirable for a speech therapist and a clinical psychologist to join forces as members of a therapeutic team, each making use of the techniques available to him for the diagnosis of the stutterer's needs and the providing of a therapeutic situation in which these needs might be met.

For at least twenty years, there has been a pretty general agreement that stuttering is closely related to emotional disturbances. Whether the emotional disturbances are the cause, the result, or a concomitant aspect of, the stuttering continues to be considered debatable. Still, there is a general agreement that psychological tests capable of exploring the patterning of personality may be employed with profit in the treatment of stuttering.

As might be expected, an examination of the literature produces a number of studies in which psychological tests of personality have been used with stuttering subjects. In one of the earliest of these studies, McDowell<sup>1</sup> in 1928 included a personality questionnaire and a word association test in a battery she administered to stutterers and non-stutterers, concluding that there were no significant differences between the two groups.

Johnson<sup>2</sup>, in 1932, reported a study in which he used the Woodworth-House Mental Hygiene Inventory, and concluded that college stutterers were more shy, more anxious, and more depressed than non-stutterers, though not as extreme in their evidences of nervous instability as a group of psychoneurotics.

In the decade between 1934 and 1944, two studies by Meltzer<sup>3,4</sup>, one by Ingebregtsen<sup>5</sup> and one by Richardson<sup>6</sup> were reported, all mak-

---

<sup>1</sup>E. D. McDowell, *Educational and Emotional Adjustment of Stuttering Children*. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University. New York, 1928.

<sup>2</sup>Wendell Johnson, "Influence of Stuttering on the Personality." *University of Iowa Studies: Studies in Child Welfare*, V, 5 (1932).

<sup>3</sup>H. Meltzer, "Personality Differences among Stuttering Children as Indicated by the Rorschach Test." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, IV, 2 (April, 1934), 262-282.

<sup>4</sup>H. Meltzer, "Personality Differences Between Stuttering and Non-Stuttering Children as Indicated by the Rorschach Test." *Journal of Psychology*, XVII, 1 (January, 1944), 39-59.

<sup>5</sup>Erling Ingebregtsen, "Some Experiment Contributions to the Psychology

ing use of the Rorschach Inkblot Test along with other tests of the projective type on stuttering populations. While these studies differ on a number of details, they agree in concluding that stutterers as a group react differently from non-stutterers, and that the direction of these differences suggest significant emotional disturbances.

This finding is in agreement with the conclusions of Bender<sup>7</sup>, who in 1942 made a similar comparison of stutterers and non-stutterers, using the Bernreuter Personality Inventory as his instrument of measurement.

The studies briefly reviewed here permit several generalizations that will be of interest to the speech therapist who wishes to know what help he can expect from psychological tests for stutterers.

1. The evidence indicates that personality tests of the paper-and-pencil sort do not dig deep enough to get at the patternings that differentiate stutterers from non-stutterers. This probably accounts for the negative findings of the McDowell and similar studies.

2. While the Rorschach Inkblot Test and other varieties of unstructured projective tests offer the most promising means yet developed by the clinical psychologist for giving clues to the emotional imbalances associated with stuttering, the results that investigators report remain in some respects ambiguous and tentative, even inconsistent. The two studies by Meltzer, for example, report that stutterers as a group give more color and movement responses than non-stutterers; but this finding is contradicted by the Ingebregtsen, the Richardson, and our own results. Each result, of course, is susceptible of a quite different interpretation.

3. Inconsistent findings of the kind just noted emphasize the point that Rorschach responses must be interpreted to be made intelligible. Further, such results call attention to a feature of most published studies which, in the opinion of the present investigators, is open to strong criticism: the assumption that stutterers constitute some sort of homogeneous group in the patterning of emotional disturbance. Our own results, as far as we have carried them, supports

---

and Psychopathology of Stutterers." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, VI, 4 (October, 1936), 630-650.

<sup>6</sup>LaVange Hunt Richardson, "The Personality of Stutterers," *Psychological Monographs*, LVI, 7 (1944), 1-39.

<sup>7</sup>James F. Bender, "The Stuttering Personality," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, XII, 1 (January, 1942), 140-146.

no such assumption. On the contrary, it would seem that the greatest virtue of projective tests like the Rorschach is their capacity for taking into account intra-group, as well as inter-group differences. The testing of individual stutterers would be a pointless procedure unless it were possible from the results to describe not only how stutterers differ from non-stutterers, but how one stutterer differs from another as well.

4. Previous studies employing projective tests with stutterers have been concerned mainly to filter out the dimensions of social disturbance that differentiate stutterers as a group from non-stutterers. Implications for therapy seem to have been given little attention. The effort to devise routine clinical procedures that may be expected to modify the stubborn, ingrained pattern of social non-participation that so often marks the stutterer is still very much in its uncertain infancy, and the evaluation of these procedures remains a task for the future.

While both of the present investigators are anxious to have it clearly understood that they regard the work done thus far as a pilot experiment, and while the refinement of methods and the availability of a larger number of subjects may be expected to revise the general picture, it seems proper to list tentatively what has been observed thus far.

1. The present data strongly supports the opinion that stutterers exhibit, in addition to their deviate speech, definite emotional disturbances. The clinical psychologist participating in this study was asked, on the basis of his test results, to decide how many of the subjects, if their stuttering were ignored, would be recommended for psychotherapy. It was his judgment that, of the 17 subjects tested, 15 were seriously enough disturbed to warrant recommendations of psychotherapy. Such a finding is most sobering to the speech therapist who naively assumes that his only concern is to help the stutterer control his erratic vocal mechanism. It suggests that the resources of a clinical psychologist are not only helpful, but are, more likely, indispensable in the treatment of stuttering.

On the other hand, the prominence of emotional adjustment in the stutterer's total problem does not eliminate the need for speech therapy.

The stutterer, because he thinks of his difficulty as an impediment of speech, is likely to seek his assistance from a speech clinic if he

seeks it at all. Clinical experience suggests that the stutterer must grow in insight and objectivity before he is prepared to recognize how his deviate speech is imbedded in a larger picture of social withdrawal and non-participation. Clinical experience further suggests that the adult stutterer, out of his repeatedly unsuccessful speaking experiences, has developed deeply-imbedded eccentricities of vocal performance which are properly the concern of the speech therapist.

There has been a long and honorable debate among those who have concerned themselves with stuttering as to what kind of casual relation exists between stuttering speech and emotional disturbances. The present investigation offers no evidence on this point one way or the other. But it would seem, as Backus<sup>8</sup> has argued, that in the case of adult stutterers the question may well be irrelevant. The attempt to designate as cause and effect the deviate speech and the emotional disturbance both of which typically occur in stuttering is to impose a static terminology on a fluid situation where the stutterer reacts now by non-fluent speech and again by a pattern of social withdrawal and non-participation; with the two interrelated and reciprocally strengthening one another.

2. Clinical procedures with adult stutterers at the outset are largely concerned with the collection of information about the stutterer as an individual. Since this is so, it may well be asked what projective tests can tell the speech therapist about the personality patternings of his cases which he, sooner or later, would not find out for himself. To explore this point, the two investigators participating in the present study made independent comparative rankings of the social adequacy of 17 stutterers, in terms of the amount of emotional disturbance they exhibited, the clinical psychologist using his test results as the basis of judgment, and the speech therapist using his clinical contacts with the group over a period of a year and a half. The coefficient of correlation between these two independent rankings was .44, a correlation that is positive, but far from perfect.

Of course, a similar procedure with a larger group of subjects might be expected to produce a higher correlation; but it also seems clear that, insofar as the results of projective tests can be depended upon, they provide information about stutterers that cannot be reproduced by clinical observations alone.

<sup>8</sup>Ollie Backus, "Personality Structure in Relation to Speech Therapy," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XXXVI, 1 (Feb., 1950), 51-56.

3. Another question of persistent interest wherever psychological evaluations of personality have been employed with stutterers has been whether or not some distinctive patterning of emotional disturbance could be assigned to stutterers. The findings of the present study agree with previous studies that most stutterers show emotional disturbance in measurable amounts; but they indicate that these stutterers do not exhibit a clearly defined characteristic patterning of personality deviations. The clinical psychologist participating in the present study is of the opinion, on the basis of the projective tests administered, that all of the 17 persons tested show emotional disturbances ranging from moderate to severe; and it is tentatively concluded that this group of 17 persons includes one schizophrenic, one homosexual, two severe hysterics, nine persons who show signs of extreme rigidity, strict rational control, and compulsive characteristics; at least 10 show evidence of extreme anxiety, a few manifesting this in the form of blocking; and at least eight of these persons show signs of extreme immaturity in the general psychologic picture. Two of these persons show definite indications of some form of organic pathology.

It should be understood that the foregoing is an effort to place stutterers, on the basis of their responses to a battery of projective tests, in established categories of personality disturbance familiar to a clinical psychologist. It is clear, however, that the evidence thus far accumulated points to a diversity of personality deviations in stutterers rather than some narrowly conceived pattern that could meaningfully be designated "the stuttering personality."

In summary, the present study describes a cooperative project in which a speech therapist and a clinical psychologist have joined forces to explore the usefulness of psychological tests of the projective type in planning speech therapy programs for adult stutterers. To date, the psychological battery has been administered to a group of 17 stutterers, all of whom have received speech therapy for a period ranging from six months to a year and a half. The programs have combined individual and group procedures, with a strong emphasis on the modification of social patterns of behavior.

While conclusions must remain tentative until results are available for a larger group of subjects, present indications are:

1. Projective tests are valuable in planning programs of speech therapy for stutterers because most stutterers exhibit, in addition to deviate speech, significant amounts of emotional disturbance.

2. The positive, but low, correlation (.44) between rankings of stutterers as to extent of emotional disturbance by a clinical psychologist on the basis of projective test results and a speech therapist on the basis of clinical contacts suggests that such tests serve to call attention to personality needs that a speech therapist otherwise might remain unaware of.

3. There is no patterning of emotional disturbance in stutterers which is characteristically different from that found in other emotionally disturbed persons who do not stutter; nor do stutterers indicate, by their responses to projective tests, a stereotyped "stuttering personality." Projective tests are valuable in planning programs of therapy for stutterers because they serve to show that stutterers may behave like stutterers for quite different reasons.

## ABOUT THE PRONUNCIATION OF SIX FRESHMEN FROM SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

JAMES W. ABEL\*

What is the nature of the pronunciation used by college freshmen who are Negroes? This question, an outgrowth of teaching experience in Hawaii, could not be answered there, because the Negro population of the territory is relatively very small. It was not until the writer returned to Louisiana that work on the problem became practicable.

One of the first sources to which the writer turned for already existent data on the subject was the work books of the Dialect Atlas of Louisiana.<sup>1</sup> Up until September, 1947, sixty-five work books had been completed. The information for nine of these books was supplied by Negroes, but none had gone beyond the sixth grade. Search of the literature pertaining to what has come, as a matter of convention, to be called Negro dialect threw no more light on the pronunciation of the educational group in question than had the work books.

These work books were not without their value, however. They pointed the way to tools, procedures, principles, and a frame of reference which were usable and desirable for an investigation aimed at making a beginning in Louisiana on the answer to the question in mind. The tool which needs to be remarked on here is the questionnaire used for collecting the data of the *Linguistic Atlas of New England* as revised for the South Atlantic states and as expanded for use in Louisiana. The procedures and principles are those laid down by the men who made the New England investigation and are the ones by which subsequent dialect atlas workers in other parts of the United States have been guided. The frame of reference is the aforementioned Dialect Atlas of Louisiana. To provide for such eventualities as the possible desire to compare the findings of this study with similar data already collected in Louisiana, it was deemed desirable to carry out the present investigation in such a way as to make it complimentary to the raw data of the Louisiana Atlas. Hence the study on which this article is based was undertaken not as something apart, but as a portion of a larger whole.

\*Instructor in Speech, Brooklyn College.

<sup>1</sup>These are on file in the office of the Speech Department and in Hill Memorial Library at Louisiana State University.

To this end and in order that the procedures be consonant with the general practices of linguistic atlas work in the United States, it was decided the six informants to be used should meet the following requirements: As a group, one, they should represent four speech areas tentatively delineated within Louisiana,<sup>2</sup> and two, within the limits of availability, they should come from certain so-called preferred communities. As individuals, before coming to college, each should have been a life-long resident of one community, and none should have had experience likely to cause his speech to be atypical of his home community. The communities referred to as preferred are communities from which white, and in some cases Negro, informants had been drawn by previous Louisiana Atlas workers.

As a result of the unstinted cooperation of Southern University, it was possible to obtain six informants who met all these requirements except that two came from other than preferred communities. In September, 1947, Dr. Felton G. Clark, President of Southern University, was asked whether it would be possible for me to undertake the proposed project on his campus. Soon after Dr. Clark's reply, cordially offering every possible cooperation, I began to spend the school hours, five days per week at Southern.

At first, I was just around, so to speak. For a period I attended classes. Concurrently, with the help of the staff of the Lower College Center and the teachers of English, the search for informants was carried on. All of the time I was gaining valuable ear-training and was becoming a familiar figure on the campus. It was not long before the members of the faculty, staff, and student body made me feel that I was an accepted member of the campus community. This is important, because had such a condition not prevailed, it would have been most difficult to establish a relationship with informants conducive to unstudied speech responses. The creation of such rapport is an essential, initial procedural step in any linguistic atlas investigation. It is of even greater importance when there is a racial difference between investigator and informant. That my informants did feel at ease is most clearly brought out by two or three examples. The answers given by two informants to questions about my race leave doubt as to whether they realized we are of different color groups. One felt free to make a typical college-boy's request for a small loan.

---

<sup>2</sup>See C. M. Wise, "The Dialect Atlas of Louisiana — A Report of Progress," *Studies in Linguistics*, III (1945), 37-42.



There was to be a dance that night, and his check had not come from home. He repaid promptly. A third lightened almost every interview with good funny stories. Techniques of a more tangible nature used in obtaining the data were essentially those employed by all atlas field workers. Since the details of these techniques are available elsewhere,<sup>3</sup> it seems sufficient to say here that a series of conversations was held with each informant. These revolved around questions asked of the informants. The questions were designed to elicit some one thousand words and phrases from each informant without my having previously used the expression in point. So far as possible, the critical portions of all replies were recorded phonetically.

By the first of November these conversations were being carried on with six conscientious informants. Each came in for an hour, three to five times per week, until his work book was finished. The completion of the collection of data just prior to Christmas marked the end of two and one-half months at Southern, a sojourn which had been throughout a truly gratifying experience in human relations.

With the collected data preliminarily organized, work began on the second major phase of the project, namely, analysis of the phonetically recorded pronunciation to determine to what extent and in what ways it deviates from standard southern American pronunciation.<sup>4</sup>

The analysis indicates two general facts. One is that with relatively few exceptions, the standard sound is more often used by an informant than some deviation from the norm. However, there is a sufficient number of deviations which parallel standard practices in dialects of English other than southern American to give the acoustic effect of mixed sound systems, and a sufficient number of sub-standard deviations occur to mar the pronunciation patterns.

Most of the deviations which account for the effect of mixed sound systems are pronunciations which more nearly parallel standard general American than the usual southern usage. Of particular note are the choice of |  $\epsilon$  |, or an |  $\epsilon$  |-like sound, rather than |  $\ae$  |, as

---

<sup>3</sup>See Hans Kurath, *Handbook of the Linguistic Geography of New England* (Providence, R. I.: Brown University, 1939), pp. 48-50 and Bernard Bloch, "Interviewing for the Linguistic Atlas," *American Speech*, X (1935), 3-9.

<sup>4</sup>The basic guide used in deciding whether a pronunciation conforms to standard southern practices is the section of G. W. Gray and C. M. Wise, *Bases of Speech* (rev. ed), entitled "The Sound System: Standard Southern," 258-265.

*care*, *pair*, and *wear*; the use of | ə |, rather than unstressed | ɪ |, in suffixes spelled *-ed*, *-es*, *-ess*, *-et*, *-en* preceded by a high front vowel the sound to be given to *a*, *ai*, or *ea* followed by *r* in such words as in the stem, *-ice*, *-id*, *-in*, *-ip*, *-is*, *-it*, *-uce*, and *-ute*; and the use of a retroflex sound in place of | ə |.

The second fact indicated by the analysis is that the bulk of the substandard pronunciation exemplify substandard practices which previous observers have catalogued as southernisms or as practices common to all the major American dialects. An over-all idea of the substandard aspect of the speech of the informants for this study can be obtained by illustrating this second fact in some detail.

First, there are pronunciations which exemplify substandard practices common to all American speech. Four of the informants are consistent, or almost consistent, in their use of | n | for | ŋ | in such a word as *going*. A frequent concomitant deviation is the use of schwa instead of | ɪ |, the total result being | ən | for | ɪŋ |. Another example of a substitution affecting a specific sound is the fronting and raising of | ʌ | before front consonants to produce such as | dʒɛʌs | for *just*.

Also exemplified are substandard practices which affect more than one sound. One is the omission of consonants. The loss of | t | and | d | is noted by observers, and so it is here in such as | mɑrtɪ |, | plɛnɪ | | sɔf |, and | ves |; then again in | pæk | and | ʌnræp | for *packed* and *unwrapped*; also as in | bɪən | for *bitten* and | tʃɪrən | in place of *children*; or | grænmə |, | təvəl mɪ |, and | kəvəl | for *grandma*, *told me*, and *cold*; and in the expression, I | Ńnt | *feel so good*. When postconsonantal | t | is omitted, it usually follows | n |, | f |, | k |, | s |, or | p |. When postconsonantal | d | is left out, the preceding sound is usually | n | or | l |, especially | n |. Among other common consonant omissions are the loss of | p | from | sps |, as in | wɔs | for *wasps*; omission of | k | from | skt |, resulting in the familiar | æst |; the dropping of the final | s | from | sks | and | sts | to produce such as | tʌsk | and | kɔst | for *tusks* and *costs*; and the omission of | l | before palatals, as in *William* | wɪjəm |.

The pronunciations of one or more of these students, illustrate the loss of consonants through dissimilation. The specific consonants lost are | t |, from such as *Saturday* and *turtle*; | g | from *recognize*; | n | from, for example, *pregnant* and, of course, *government*; and | r | from *library* and *secretary*.

Turning from the loss of consonants to the loss of medial unstressed vowels, that is, to syncope, we find both unstressed |ɪ| and schwa syncopated. Mention has already been made of the use of |n| for |ŋ|. When, as in a word such as *getting*, the consonant preceding the unstressed |ɪ| of *-ing* is homorganic, or nearly homorganic, with |n|, the |ɪ| is sometimes lost, resulting in such as |getŋ|, |saɪdŋ|, |ɪnkɹɪʃŋ|, and |wafŋ|. Other than in *-ing*, syncope of unstressed |ɪ| occurs in such words as *believe* and *auditorium*, resulting in |blɪv| and |ɑdɪtɔrəm|. Typical of pronunciations from which schwa is syncopated are |ɑrndʒəz| and |nɪu ɔlɪnz| in place of *oranges* and *New Orleans*.

Since syncope is closely associated with stress, it is appropriate to comment at this point that deviations also occur in these pronunciations due to restressing, faulty unstressing, and the misplacing of stress.

Each of the foregoing is a common substandard practice affecting vowels, as are two others, namely, the raising of vowels before front consonants and the centralization of vowels. The two vowels raised before front consonants by these speakers are |æ| and |ɛ| as in *catch* and *France* pronounced with |ɛ|; *bad* and *gas* said with |æ|; and *get* and *kettle* pronounced |gɪt| and |kɪt|. Centralization affects the two high front vowels, |i| and |ɪ|. Centralized |ɪ| occurs particularly in the words *little*, *pretty*, and *wish*. In terms of phonetic context, it occurs most often when |ɪ| stands next to |l|, |w|, or |ʌ|. |ɛ| and |ʊ| are also centralized, as in |dʒɛɪl| and |tʌk|.

In any review of common pronunciation faults concerning vowels, nasalization always has a place. The speech of these informants is not characterized by nasalization. Yet, they do nasalize at times. Most of the nasalization occurs as a part of a more complex deviation. A nasal sound is lost entirely and the preceding vowel is nasalized in compensation. Consequently we have, for example, |kɑfət|, |æsə|, and |hɑ| for *comfort*, *answer*, and *hung*. When simple nasalization does occur, the following sound is |n| or |ŋ|, usually the former, and the sounds nasalized are usually front vowels or diphthongs beginning with front vowels.

Returning to the category of consonants, this time to their modification rather than loss, we find examples of the common faults of unvoicing and erroneous voicing. The voiced plosives and the fricatives |v| and |z| are sometimes unvoiced, as in |kɹɪp| for *crib*,

| berət | for *buried*, | piɣ | for *pig*, | əf ðə | for *of the*, and | hʌsbən | for *husband*. The voiceless plosives and the fricatives | s | and | θ | are sometimes voiced, as in | flæpdʒæk |, | laɪdɪd |, | bækwədʒ |, | mæəə |, and | gæs |.

The fact is not being overlooked that when unvoicing takes place, say, before a following voiceless consonant or erroneous voicing occurs between two vowels, the resultant pronunciations can quite properly be attributed to assimilation, a source of a variety of errors in speech everywhere. In these data there are a great many aberrations which may be considered as due to assimilative forces. For the present, necessarily cursory consideration, some of the more obvious examples have been chosen. Such as | bats | for *box* and | ætsəl | for *axle* appear to be the result of partial regressive assimilation, the following alveolar | s | having lead to the use of an alveolar plosive, | t |, in place of the normal velar, | k |. Partial regressive influence with somewhat different results is illustrated by | wɒnəs fəl | for *walnut shell* and | pits:ɪdz | for *peach seeds*. In the samples just given, the preceding sound is changed under the influence of the succeeding one. In speech in general and in the pronunciations of these informants, there are cases in which anticipation of the following sound results in complete omission of the preceding one, i.e., complete regressive assimilation occurs. Examples from these data are | bɪskəs |, | sɪ daʊn |, and | gu nart |, for *biscuits*, *sit down*, and *goodnight*.

Also found are such pronunciations as | kɪkt | də | for *kicked the*, | heltɪ | for *healthy*, | sɪkst | for *sixth*, | wɒst | for *wasp*, | kæstət | for *casket*, and | hʌst | in place of *husk*, all of which appear to be due to progressive assimilation affecting a partial change in the following sound. Complete progressive assimilation is illustrated by the words *remember*, *drinks*, and *chimney* rendered | rəmɛmə |, | drɛnz |, and | tʃɪmlɪ |, and by the perennial | sʌmpn |.

Just as there are many articulatory deviations in these data which may be considered as assimilative in nature, there are many which in a general way parallel such historical tendencies as the lax articulation of consonants and the rendering of certain vowels in a manner different from current standard practice. Laxity of consonant articulation to the point of omission has been illustrated already in other connections. There are also numerous pronunciations in the data in which consonants have not entirely disappeared but in which they

are weakly articulated. Examples of vowel deviations which in a general fashion parallel historical practices will be given later in connection with pronunciations which illustrate southern substandardisms. Specific archaic pronunciations recorded include |kɪr| and |tʃɪr| for *care* and *chair*; |dɪf| in place of *deaf*; |drɪnən| for *draining*; |gɑ'dɪn| for *guardian*; |haɪst| and |dʒaɪnt| instead of *hoist* and *joint*; and |mʌʃələn| for *muskmelon*. All of the informants use |ʃ| instead of |sk| in this last word.

Analogy is another source of error in pronunciation shared by speakers of all three major American dialects. In the speech of these informants it leads to error particularly in the rendering of postvocalic and intervocalic *r*. In standard southern, when *r* is preceded by |ɪ|, |ɛ|, |æ|, |o|, |ʊ|, |aɪ|, or |aʊ| in monosyllables and stressed syllables, the *r* is given the sound of schwa. When these informants weaken it or omit it, as in |tʃɪfəl| |keləs|, |mo:|, |ʃʊ|, and |aʊ|, for *cheerful*, *careless*, *more*, *sure*, and *our*, the apparent explanation is false analogy with the standard treatment of *r* after |ɑ| and |ɔ|. After |ɑ|, *r* is silent; after |ɔ|, it may or may not be given the sound of schwa. Similarly, when intervocalic *r* is omitted, weakened, or given the sound of schwa, the cause seems to lie in the fact that there are so many contexts in standard southern in which *r* is unsounded or is given the value of schwa.

So far, all the common errors of pronunciation considered have to do with the loss, weakening, or change of sounds. There are also commonly-found pronunciations which are in error because they contain superfluous sounds. When these appear because properly silent letters are sounded the classification spelling pronunciation is used. The bulk of this category is made up of pronunciations on which the informants tend to agree, namely, |fʃhed|, |ɔftən|, |təwɔd|, |alməndz|, and |lʊɪsvɪl|. Superfluous sounds which are not represented by spelling take the forms of intrusive glides, as |l| in |tʃɪmlr|, |j| in |gjæs|, and |r| in |portʃt| for *poached*; extra syllables, as in |draʊndəd| and |ʌmbərələ| or |pouɪstəz| and |aɪvəri| for *posts* and *ivy*; and superfluous |t|, as in |sɜmənt| in place of *sermon*.

As has been said, there are also pronunciations recorded which exemplify what have been catalogued as southern substandard practices. One such practice is drawling, which in these data is manifest by over-long sounds and conspicuous off-glides. All stressed vowels

and some diphthongs are affected. Selected examples are | si:sɔŋ |, | skɪən |, | slɛəd |, | bæɪk |, | mɑ:l |, | aʊwə |, | klauzət |, | hɔ:g |, | tɔ:ɪz |, | so: ta:d |, | bu:frog |, | wu:n |, | dʒaɪdʒ |, and | skwɜ:l |.

The use of | ɛ |, or a sound approaching | ɛ |, in place of | ɪ | before nasals and the reverse, i.e., the use of | ɪ |, or a sound approaching | ɪ |, in place of | ɛ | before nasals are errors frequently heard in the South. Illustrations of this apparent reversal taken from these data are, on the one hand, | ɛɛŋ | and | ɛɛŋk |, or | bɪrɪn | for *bin*; on the other, | pɪn | for *pen*; | tɪn | for *ten*; | stɪm |, | tɪnɪsɪ |, and | dʒɪntɪmən |.

Another vowel modification affecting | ɛ | is the use of | ɛɪ |, or an | ɛɪ | -like sound in place of it. When these informants indulge in this error, the following sound is usually a voiced consonant, especially | d |, as in | ʃɛɪd |, | hɛɪd |, and | leɪg | for *shed*, *head*, and *leg*.

The use of | ɪ | for | ɛ |, | ɛ | for | ɪ |, and | ɛɪ | for | ɛ | not only illustrates contemporary southern substandard practice; it also parallels historical tendencies in the treatment of these vowels.

In substandard southern speech in general and in the pronunciations of these informants | ɛɪ |, or an | ɛɪ | -like sound, is not only sometimes substituted for | ɛ |, but for | æ | as well, as in | brɛɪ-ɪntʃ |, | ɛɪnt |, and | gleɪs | for *branch*, *aunt*, and *glass*.

| ɛɪ |, however, is not always the substituted sound. The appearance of such as | æfred | and | tek | for *afraid* and *take* in the responses illustrates another southern substandardism, namely, the use of | ɛ | for | ɛɪ |.

With the possible exception of the drawl, the treatment of the diphthong | aɪ | has become the popular hallmark of substandard southern speech. Among the more common modifications are the weakening or loss of the second element and the use of | ɑ | in place of | aɪ |. These are illustrated here by articulations of such as *time*, *died*, *while*, and *beside* in which the final element of the diphthong is present but weakened. Complete loss of this second element is exemplified by | wɑ | for *wire*, | ta:d |, and | kla:md |, to select a few. Less frequent, but present, are such as | ɑɪf | for *Irish*.

Another diphthong which is similarly treated in substandard southern is | ɔɪ |, illustrated here by such as *spoiled* and *boys* said with | ɔɪ | reduced to | ɔ | or with the | ɪ | element weakened.

Finally, we may select from the practices illustrated one which is not followed by these informants as often as might be expected, con-

sidering its general prevalency. It is the use of |ɔ| in place of |ɑ| in such words as *car* and *park*. But this deviation does occur as evidenced by such as |bɔrnjard|, |lɔdʒ|, and |pɔtr| for *barnyard*, *large*, and *party*.

From what has been said to this point, it is seen that the deviating pronunciations recorded can be divided into two groups: (1) Those which more nearly resemble standard pronunciations in dialects of American other than southern American, and (2) Those which are substandard. Most of this latter group are not peculiar to the informants to this study, but illustrate such already recognized substandard practices as referred to in the preceding paragraphs. The remaining substandard deviations are not only relatively few in number but are so heterogeneous as to make selected illustration misleading. The question logically arises: Are the pronunciations making up this minority group peculiar to the informants using them? The answer must await further work on additional comprehensive surveys as the one of which, as has been said earlier, this study is but a part.

## HOW DO YOU TEACH LISTENING?

FRANCIS E. DRAKE\*

Last fall at the meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English in Milwaukee, Angela Broening introduced herself by stating, "Every speaker must have a listener, and every listener must have his speaker." Miss Broening's facetious comment directs us to an obvious situation in our speech classes which we frequently overlook. Every one of our students has about twenty times as many listening experiences as he has speaking experiences. We help him with his speaking, but we allow his listening to go undirected. What can we as speech teachers do to utilize these listening experiences which exist in our classrooms? How can we help the passive student improve his listening habits while his classmates are speaking?

For the past two years, we in the Academic Instructor Division of the Air University have been exploring possible approaches to teaching better listening habits. Early in 1949 we added an hour of instruction based upon Ralph Nichol's early research.<sup>1</sup> This hour was a lecture which described the importance of listening and outlined specific techniques which a student can use to get more out of a lecture. Although students commented favorably upon this hour, we realized that a lecture approach cannot achieve what actual classroom exercise can. Teaching listening by lecture alone is somewhat analogous to teaching speech by lecture alone. Consequently, we began to search for possible places in the curriculum to use directed listening techniques.

Because the mission of the Academic Instructor Division is to prepare officers to teach in Air Force schools, we emphasize speech improvement in our course. Before the students begin their practice teaching, we give them a short block of instruction in oral communication which includes four lectures and four exercises in speaking. Before we experimented with listening in the speech phase of the

---

\*Mr. Drake, who is on a two year leave of absence from the University of Minnesota, is serving as Consultant in Communication Skills with the Academic Instructor Division of the Air Command and Staff School of the Air University, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama.

<sup>1</sup>Ralph G. Nichol, "Factors in Listening Comprehension," *Speech Monographs*, XVI (1948), 154-63.



course, these lectures described ways of improving voice, overcoming stage fright, preparing a speech, and developing effective physical activity. The four exercises approximated the usual assignment in a college or high school public speaking course:

1. A short introductory talk.
2. A verbal precision speech.
3. An extemporaneous speech.
4. An impromptu speech.

Because of the nature of the lectures and of the assignments, the instructor had to center his criticism of the speeches of the students upon the form factors of speaking, such as posture, voice, and gestures.

In order to include listening exercises in the speech phase of the course, we first revised our total approach to speech. Paul Bagwell's excellent discussion of speech and writing which appeared in the *Quarterly Journal of Speech* for February 1945<sup>2</sup> helped us in our revision. We changed our emphasis in teaching speech from what Bagwell terms "form factors" (posture, gesture, voice) to what he terms "content factors" (organization, language choice, method of communication). Our lectures now describe the meaning of communication, specific ways of communicating, organizing material for communication, and use of language in communication. In place of the four exercises which emphasized types of speeches, we now include four exercises which emphasize content. These exercises direct the student:

1. To communicate an idea or principle by using specific examples.
2. To communicate an idea or principle by using comparison and contrast in addition to examples.
3. To stimulate an idea or principle in the minds of the audience by asking specific questions.
4. To communicate an idea or principle effectively by using a combination of methods.

With these assignments, it is an easy matter to add an exercise in listening. After a student speaks, each of his classmates is asked to write down the main idea or generalization which has been communicated. The listener is also asked to reproduce the underlying struc-

<sup>2</sup>Paul D. Bagwell, "Composite Course in Writing and Speaking," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XXXI (1945), 79-87.

ture of the speech — that is, to identify three or four subordinate ideas which contribute to the main idea or thesis.

Although this listening exercise appears to be very simple, it actually is a task for many of the students. For example, one student speaker in developing the concept that we need to see the other man's point of view in dealing with world affairs, pointed out that we must understand countries in Asia in terms of their history. As an example, he mentioned that parts of China have been "carpet bagged" for years. In developing further the failure of Americans to recognize the Asiatic's attitude toward us, he brought in the fact that nationalistic pride dislikes charity. Although this speech was brilliantly organized and delivered, the listeners' reactions were surprising. A few students came up with the intended broad generalization; too many of them wrote down miscellaneous specific points such as "Asiatics are proud" and "China has been carpet bagged."

With practice, the students who are initially rather inefficient listeners, develop skill in finding main ideas and in relating these ideas structurally to the thesis of the speech. Furthermore, this exercise in listening is also an effective motivation for the student speaker. When a student speaker finds that only twenty per cent of his audience gets the idea he intended, he begins to realize the complexity of the act of oral communication. He senses the differences existing within his audience and strives to meet this challenge by selecting a variety of concrete supporting material which will more fully cover the range of experience of his audience.

This linking of listening and speaking emphasizes communication as an act in which both speaker and listener share responsibility. It is probably impossible to define where the speaker's responsibility ends and the listener's begins. However, an alert instructor in leading the class discussion following each speech can stimulate a great deal of learning. He can point out faulty listening habits to the listeners at the same time that he comments on the strong and weak points of the speaker. Occasionally, after a speech has been delivered, the instructor will want to have the class through discussion reproduce the entire structure of the speech on the blackboard. A comparison of the listeners' reproduction with the outline which the speaker prepared before his speech, can serve to instruct both speaker and listener in the fine points of effective organization.

We in the Academic Instructor Division have found this combi-

nation of listening and speaking to be particularly beneficial to student criticism. In the past, students used to say, "Joe seemed nervous," or "Smith had his hands in his pockets." Now that we have provided the students with a definite objective in terms of an idea to be communicated, their criticism becomes constructive. Now they say, "Joe's analogy was helpful in explaining that process," or "Smith should have supported his idea with a personal anecdote."

In comparing the results of our present "speaking-listening" method with our results when we emphasized speaking alone, we find the following major advantages for our present method:

1. Students attend to the content of a speech rather than to mannerisms of speaking.
2. Students learn effective listening habits.
3. Students actually discover their shortcomings as oral communicators.
4. Students realize the difficulties encountered by every speaker in reaching all members of his audience.
5. Students recognize oral communication as a responsibility shared by speaker and listener.

## RADIO AND THE QUALITY OF LIVING

J. CLARK WEAVER\*

The quality of our present radio fare as it effects our living is a topic that has emerged from the small gatherings of the specialists and jostled its way into the arena. That the public at large is concerned is indicated by the appearance of an article in LIFE MAGAZINE, a magazine of general circulation, not one catering to the tastes of a minority group interested in Capital "C" culture.

This LIFE MAGAZINE article, appearing in the November 6, 1950 issue, deplored the low level of current radio fare. The editors of LIFE must have believed that the article would be of interest to their 5,200,000<sup>1</sup> readers, and that a majority of them would give approving nods if nothing else. In 1946 Lazarsfeld and Field<sup>2</sup> reported that 35% of the listeners had no opinion about what they heard from their radios. Of the remaining 65%, the people who had opinions, 80% thought that radio was doing either an excellent or a good job. In 1950, nearly 45 million American homes enjoyed some form of radio. Presumably some of these homes also had copies of LIFE MAGAZINE. It would seem there must be a change in the opinion of the 80% of the *critical* listeners. And there may be a change in the percentage of *uncritical* listeners. The time seems near when radio must *reconsider* its program fare and the contribution it is making to our way of living.

Too often when we talk about radio, we talk about how to produce what comes out of the loud speaker. But if we are to discuss radio in its larger sense we have to go beyond radio techniques, programs, stars, and scripts. We must consider radio in terms of the effect of its loud speakers on the millions who still depend upon them for entertainment, information, and culture. To understand the change from the uncritical acceptance and approval of radio, we must examine the forces which lie behind radio programs. We must understand radio for what it is, a business.

Radio is a double-faced business. To the men who operate it,

---

\*Assistant Professor of Speech, University of Florida.

<sup>1</sup>Statement of the number of LIFE MAGAZINE readers on the front cover of November, 1950, issues.

<sup>2</sup>Lazarsfeld and Field, *The Listeners Look at Radio* (Chapel Hill, 1946).

radio is the entertainment business; to the men who own it, radio is the advertising business. A comparison of the gross billings for the year 1939 and 1949 will indicate both the size and the speed of growth of the business. In 1939 the gross billings for radio advertising were \$181,114,000. The figure for 1949 is the astronomical one of \$637,300,000, or more than triple the 1939 figure. The Pet Milk account alone is reported in SPONSOR MAGAZINE to be in the neighborhood of \$6,000,000 for 1950. The three big soap companies are expected to spend for radio advertising more than \$21,000,000. These figures show who pays for the radio programs we hear. They also show the role of the advertising agencies in program planning.

The advertising agencies' primary problem is that of selling large amounts of the sponsor's goods as cheaply as possible. The radio listener becomes a person to be acted upon, moved to perform a certain act. This is a different role from the one assigned him by the pioneers of the industry. Owen D. Young in 1929 stated of radio that, "its aim has never been to make money, but rather to offer programs of such varied interest that our people could not afford to miss them."<sup>3</sup>

The problem now becomes one *not* of "such varied interest" but of the least that can be done to take care of "not afford to miss." But the advertising agencies have taken over radio and keep in mind the following principles:

First, the greatest good for the greatest number is not the concern of the advertising business unless it pays. Furthermore, ignorance, if properly conditioned and controlled, can be more easily persuaded to buy. The object is to increase the non-critical listener percentage. An example of the extent of this ignorance campaign is the prevalence of sponsored editorialized newscasting and news commentary. In general these programs are replacing factual news reporting. The listener is being subtly lead from fact to opinion. The *uncritical* listener is being conditioned to *confuse* the two.

Second, the agencies determine people's tastes by their economic status. The procedure is to analyze the income bracket aimed at to determine the lowest possible program denominator it will put up with. Statistics show that the farmer and the laborer make up the bracket

---

<sup>3</sup>Quoted in *FOUR YEARS OF NETWORK BROADCASTING*, a report by a committee of the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education and the American Political Science Association. Published in *Radio and Education*, 1936.

with the largest collective income. Products for mass sales are advertised by programs which the agencies believe will appeal to these income groups.

The third agency principle is that the listener must be persuaded to keep his radio turned on. Transit radio leaves him no choice in street car or bus, but at home he is free to flip the switch. The give-away program was designed to make listening a habit. We may have been bored, we may have griped, but we tended to endure, up to a certain point. As a people we do not want to miss a chance at something for nothing. The variety program is another example. Here, though we may not be amused by one performer, we are held by the thought that the next one will give us a laugh.

None of these principles is concerned with the public's interest or convenience. The answer to the question of the public's taste, what it feels it can not afford to miss, is determined by a variety of methods based on the counting of people who have their radios turned on. That the listener may be in the same position as the man who survived sixty days of jungle life by eating snakes and snails because something was better than nothing does not seem to have occurred to the counters. Originally the results of these surveys were used to show time buyers how many people were listening to specified stations or programs. Surveys are still used for this purpose with increasingly poor results. Suggestions have been made to the Association of National Advertisers that broadcasters solve this problem by adopting one standard method of measuring. "The advertisers," they were told, "are placed in the position of deciding arbitrarily which method of research gives the correct picture at a cost to both the industry and the advertiser which each are finding increasingly difficult to absorb."<sup>4</sup> In the interest of expediency the industry is being urged to ignore, not solve the problem. What the radio industry needs to know is why set owners do *NOT* listen.

A service industry cannot survive in a competitive economy if the consumer will not use the service. The problem of the radio operator has become one not of how to make a profit but increasingly one of how to survive. The advertising agencies and their employers have confused the nature of radio's business. The dictionary defines "Service" as work performed for the benefit of another. There is nothing

---

<sup>4</sup>Recent AP News story of ANA talks by Benn Duffy and Fred Manchee, BBD & O President and Executive Vice-president.

in the definition which suggests that the worker should not in turn be benefitted. But the definition states that the one for whom the work is performed *MUST* be benefitted. And the word BENEFIT is not synonymous with the word EXPLOIT. It would seem that instead of following the lead set by the advertising agencies, the radio industry must understand and take over the running of its own business.

These, then, are some of the factors which shape our current radio fare. The appearance of the LIFE MAGAZINE article indicates that people are not satisfied with radio's service. The development of TV has added a note of urgency to the problem, for added to the listeners dissatisfaction is the element of competition for his attention in his own home. If radio does manage to survive the competition of color TV, it must do so on the basis of its service to our culture, its contribution to the quality of our living. My belief is that there is room for both systems, radio and TV.

But to be a Jeremiah is not enough. Nor have we as teachers and as listeners been without blame. The time for praising and blaming is past. What we need is understanding and work.

As teachers we need to do a better job of teaching the young men and women who will work in radio and TV. The first step in this direction should be an examination of the content of what we are teaching. The usual radio curriculum contains courses in announcing, production, writing, salesmanship, and so on. These are skills the student needs. For the most part we teach these skills as skills fairly well. But such teaching is not enough. The content of skills courses must be enlarged to teach *radio and its relation to society*; radio as a vital social force. This point of view is too often given footnote status on the undergraduate level, and research status on the graduate level. It should be central in all our teaching.

Second, as teachers of radio we are turning out too many over trained and under educated graduates. An examination of college catalogues indicate that more and more major hours are being required until the student has little time for taking courses outside his specialty. The argument is that the student needs the increased specialized training in order to take his place in a competitive field. The argument assumes that a greater number of courses in radio will increase the student's chances of success. This is not necessarily so. There is no longer room in radio for the beautiful voice emerging from

an empty head. The college graduate majoring in radio needs a broad education. What we who are teaching radio need to do is increase our skill in teaching our specialty and thereby free the student to explore other fields.

Third, as teachers of radio, we need to examine our attitude toward radio. Do we regard radio as a static medium, applauding or deploring its present state, depending upon our point of view? Do we, for example, limit ourselves to trying to find new angles rather than new fields of programing? A campus radio station is of limited value if the training time is spent in aping the programs of its commercial big brother. In short, we should become leaders, not followers. We need to explore the status quo of the tastes of our listeners in addition to counting the number who are listening. Research of this nature should be the starting point, not the end in itself. However, it is usually here that our planning falls apart. We tend to assume that listeners know what they want. This is not necessarily true. An audience after it has heard something will be able to express an opinion as to whether it likes it. But a mass audience can not know whether it will like a program until after it has heard it. Because an audience does not know ahead of time what it likes or wants, does not mean that we must build our programs on the assembled known likes of the past. It seems to me that we need to practice more creative experimental programing that takes into consideration diversity of tastes and interests.

Some programing of this nature is already in progress at some educational and commercial stations. In the educational category there are such stations as WHA AM-FM, Wisconsin, recently singled out in a special study of broadcasting stations as the one doing the greatest job of serving the public interest; WNAD AM-FM, Oklahoma, serving the people of that state; WOI AM-FM and TV, Iowa, which in the recent Nehan survey held second place to the top ranking clear channel stations in listener preference. I mention only these few. In the commercial field I think of station WQXR FM, its new 13 station network, and its quality programing. There are other commercial stations in large metropolitan centers.

As teachers then, we must see that our laboratory practice sets an example of quality programing for quality living so that our students may take with them some spark of ingenuity when they enter the commercial radio industry.



Finally, as listeners, we all need to assume an active, not a passive role. Radio programs are developed and broadcast on the assumption that if they do not appeal to us we can turn the dial, flip the switch. This in part we have done. However, we rightly depend upon radio to bring us closer to our fellow beings, to enlarge our horizons. As evidence of this fact forty per cent of the 45 million plus families who enjoy some form of radio, have two or more sets.<sup>5</sup> What happens when we turn off our radio set is that we disfranchise ourselves. This we are reluctant to do. Nor should we be forced to do it. As listeners we should listen more, approve more, or disapprove more. We can do this by individual action and collective action. That individual and collective action may have some results is demonstrated by the recent protests brought against TV programing and advertising. In other words, whether we write a letter or hold a meeting is not as important as the fact that we have taken some action to make known our tastes and needs to the industry. For such action will help guarantee our cultural rights and contribute to the quality of our living.

There is no question that eventually radio as a service industry can and will speak for the real taste of the 150 million people in the United States. But before that time can come radio must rescue itself from the advertising business. We in the educational institutions, to help effect this rescue, must turn out leaders instead of followers; as listeners we all must become more active in expressing our tastes and our wishes. In the democracy we now enjoy, radio represents one of our most important freedoms. That is why we must bend every concerted effort to get what we want before we are forced to like what we get.

---

<sup>5</sup>Quoted in *Sponsor Magazine*, John W. Craig, Vice-President of the AVCO Manufacturing Corporation.

## AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF THE EVALUATION OF HEARING AIDS

THOMAS B. ANDERSON and JOHN W. BLACK\*

The belief that a particular hearing aid is more beneficial than others for an individual ear has had two effects of some scope (a) the production of several models of aids simultaneously by the same manufacturer, and (b) the development of programs of fitting or evaluating an aid for an ear. The latter practice has been both defended and attacked largely upon bases of (a) *a priori* reasoning and (b) the subjective reports from people who wear aids.

The study reported here was an effort to determine experimentally whether the aids with which the ordinary hard-of-hearing individuals were fitted in one evaluation center yielded any real advantages over the performance of an aid that might have been obtained by chance, i. e. with no procedure of fitting.

The six models of hearing aids that had been issued most frequently at this evaluation center in the six months prior to setting up the study were selected as *chance aids*. Thus the list included some highly probable aids for a person who might appear at this evaluation center for a fitting.

The first 24 persons who were fitted with aids after December 1, 1949, were arbitrarily designated the subjects (Ss), provided (a) the case showed no psychotic history, (b) the average hearing loss in the speech range did not exceed 65 db in the better ear, and (c) the case was able to follow directions and do the simple tasks that were required in the study. Fewer than one half of the cases who were fitted during the duration of the experiment qualified as Ss.

At the conclusion of the regular evaluation session S took the test relevant to this study. He responded to a phonograph recording of sets of word-reception tests (a) while wearing his fitted aid and (b) while wearing a chance aid, and in each instance while listening in (c) quiet and in (d) noise (50 db, white noise, General Radio, A scale). The order of listening conditions and of word-reception tests was altered systematically among the 24 Ss. The six chance aids were

---

\*Mr. Anderson is Instructor in Speech, Ohio State University; Professor Black is Professor of Speech and Director of the division of Speech Science at Ohio State University.

also used rotationally, each one being used with four Ss. The word-reception tests were four sets of three lists each of the Waco multiple-choice intelligibility tests. In recording the tests three voices read the lists in each set, and the same voices read all of the sets.

S listened to a constant level of continuous recorded speech and set his first aid at a comfortable level. A sustained 1000 c.p.s. tone was then fed through the aid at this level. The measured voltage output was matched when S used his second hearing aid.

The hearing-aid microphones and amplifiers were mounted immediately above and behind S's head in a sound-treated testing room.

The scores that the Ss made on each test were treated with analysis of variance in which the effects of three variables were compared: chance aid (in quiet, in noise); fitted aid (in quiet, in noise); and 24 Ss.

#### RESULTS

The analysis of variance is summarized in Table I and the means of the groups are shown in Table II. Table I shows a significant interaction between subjects and aids. In other words the Ss did not respond uniformly to the two conditions involving hearing aids. With this interaction value as *error*, the variance attributable to chance vs. fitted aids was found to be significant.

Table II indicates that this difference was highly significant (1%) when the two categories of aids were compared in noise. The data indicated that three of the 24 Ss performed consistently better with the chance aids. This accounts for the significant interaction value in Table I.

It may be important that the apparently greater difference in efficiency between chance and fitted aids appeared when the two instruments were compared under the noise condition. This moderate level of noise more nearly approaches the normal environment of the hearing aid in use than does the somewhat ideal quiet of the other test. By way of comparison, the effect of the noise was to attenuate the listening scores 12-14%. The difference between the chance and fitted aid was 6-9%. Assuming a linear scale of measurement, the mean advantage of a fitted aid was at least one half as great as the advantage of quiet over a 50 db masking noise.

The 24 Ss were fitted with nine different models of aids in these numbers: 7, 4, 4, 2, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1.

## SUMMARY

This study lends support to the practice of fitting hearing aids, or, in other words, to the belief that the same aid is not equally good for all hard-of-hearing adults. All of the aids helped the Ss, although this comparison is not shown in the study. The chance aids were ones commonly recommended in this evaluation center. Nevertheless, the results show that these aids are not to be recommended at random to ordinary hard-of-hearing persons if speech reception is the criterion measure. The amount of advantage that comes with fitting may be considered to be at least half as much as that which differentiates hearing in quiet from listening in moderate level continuous noise.

TABLE I

Summary of analysis of variance of scores made by 24 subjects while responding to listening tests with a *fitted* and a *chance* hearing aid, in quiet and in noise.

Source of Variation	D.F.	Variance
Quiet-noise (N) .....	1	2,044
Chance-fitted aid (A) .....	1	709*
Subjects (S) .....	23	328
N x A .....	1	22
N x S .....	23	107
A x S .....	23	105
N x A x S .....	23	19

\*F (Variance A/Variance A x S), 6.75, significant at the five per cent level of confidence (5%, 4.28; 1%, 7.88.)

TABLE II

Means of proportions of correct responses of the subjects while hearing 72 items in each of four experimental conditions.

	Quiet	Noise
Fitted aid .....	52.4*	40.8
Chance aid .....	46.1	32.0

\*Any difference between two means of 8.43 significant (*t*), 1%; 6.21, 5%.

## AS THE EDITOR SAYS FAREWELL

With the publication of this issue of THE SOUTHERN SPEECH JOURNAL your editor for the past three brief years completes his duties, making way for a worthy successor. The task has been a pleasant and delightful experience. Arduous duties have had their compensations.

The aim has been to produce, within the limits imposed, a Regional Journal in the finest sense of that term. Certain cohesive forces have operated in Southern history to make the South a more distinct Region than any other part of the nation. Out of much struggle and tragedy can come strength and courage. The prestige of the Southern Speech Association, together with its official publication, is a manifestation of that fact.

In the preparation of manuscripts for the successive issues high priority has been given to those which were most clearly of Regional significance. In respect to this design, little or no preference was given to writers from our Association over those outside. A result has been that more articles bearing on Southern oratory were published than any other kind. This has happened because they were made available. At the same time, if one now turns the pages of the twelve issues published, others of Regional significance in such fields as Theatre and Linguistics can be found.

In addition, the editor has endeavored to secure good papers from capable writers in our Region whose interests were varied, and thereby provide an encouraging avenue of publication for promising initiative. Many younger writers have been able to publish. Perhaps the retiring editor made his greatest contribution in acting as something of a schoolmaster for these people.

A further source of gratification has been the fact that numerous well recognized scholars from outside the South have contributed papers. A regret is that all such manuscripts could not have been published. Many of them, however, are in the files to be made available to the incoming editor.

Finally, I should be less than fair if I did not thank Professors H. Hardy Perritt and Robert B. Dierlam, successive book review editors, for their co-operative efforts in securing a quantity of excellent reviews. To no less an extent, thanks are due Professor Louise Sawyer for the splendid amount of News and Notes items she has prepared. It can only be hoped that all co-operation needed by the new editor will be as gracious as has been given me from 1948-1951.

## BOOK REVIEWS

CONSTRUCTING A PLAY: By Marian Gallaway, New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1950; pp. xx, 380. \$4.50.

The first axiom which a teacher of playwriting needs to keep constantly in mind is this: I can never teach another human being to create a play; I can only make him aware of the tools which he uses in the process of building a particular art form. Creation is another matter.

Professor Gallaway has wisely recognized this problem in *Constructing a Play* and has concentrated for the most part on the techniques which are involved in playwriting. She recognizes the complexities of writing in a medium which is unique in that it demands an understanding of many other art media. Furthermore the product of playwriting is never finished until it has been presented within the environment of theatrical convention.

Yet the subject of techniques is also an involved one. If plays were concerned only with the mechanics of plot manipulation, the presentation of human beings so that they will react consistently to the prescribed plotting without illuminating their inner motives, techniques would be a simple matter to learn. The elements of desire, emotion, and thought, however, must enter into the concept of the play and the evolution of the characters. These elements lead the writer away from craftsmanship toward artistic creation, and it is the better teacher of playwriting who can separate the techniques of craftsmanship from those which contribute as far as it is possible toward artistic creation. These latter "techniques" are a combination of knowledge as to how character is a revelation of thought and idea in relation to the artistic conception of the central situation of the play and an understanding of human nature in conflict with itself or its environment or with fate. Professor Gallaway has distinguished between the technique in which knowledge and understanding are combined in order to direct the young playwright toward the intuitive kind of writing which is close to artistic creation. Her primary basis for the latter is Hegelian, and she makes considerable use of Hegel's *The Philosophy of Fine Art* as a referent for the understanding of character creation and the development of idea. Fortunately, Professor Gallaway does not lose sight of the practical interpretation of Hegel for her beginning playwright and does not indulge in esoteric interpretation. The chief criticism to be made in this connection is that Hegel is limited as an authority on playwriting, being primarily concerned as he is with problems of aesthetic consideration.

The weaknesses of Professor Gallaway's work on playwriting lie in three directions. There is a tendency to deal in generalities. For example, the protagonist is referred to in this manner: "It has been shown that the sympathy of the audience is aroused, sustained and transformed to empathy by some individual or group of individuals whose affairs may be said to provide a focus for the play. This individual or group is the protagonist, an indispensable element of the basic structure of the play." Such a definition is satisfactory only insofar as it treats of a superficial examination of the protagonist in relation to the play as a whole, but it fails to explain the qualities which make the protagonist

a human being faced with decision and choice. In further explanation of the protagonist Professor Gallaway enlarges on these necessary elements of character, but the initial explanation is weak. One other definition will suffice to make the point even clearer. Suspense is defined as a "combination of hope and fear regarding an event which one foresees. . . . Suspense is uncertainty toward an eventuality one cares about—not only intellectual uncertainty, but hope alternating with or existing side by side with fear." The reaction of the young playwright to such definitions may be that he will become discouraged by generalities and disregard the valuable suggestions which follow.

A second weakness lies in the organization of the book. There would appear to be a lack of over-all plan for the work. The beginning playwright will find it difficult to follow the chronological development of the process of writing a play. There are too many addenda and digressions which intrude in the answer to the question: what is the process of constructing a play from the initial idea to the opening night? Furthermore there does not seem to be any particular reason for including discussions of suspense, clarity, crisis, and so forth in the particular places where Professor Gallaway chooses to include them. They are important discussions, but they do not appear to have the proper relationship to each other and to the comprehensive problem of play construction. Although there is an attempt to make necessary transition in order to reveal the course of action of the playwriting process, the various units under consideration are not clearly related, and the result is chaotic.

A third weakness lies in the omission of an analysis and discussion of dialogue. Since dialogue is the primary means by which a playwright tells his story, reveals his characters, and presents his idea, the importance of dialogue cannot be ignored. Although it might be argued that in a work on constructing a play, dialogue is an ever present consideration and needs no specific analysis, there must be more than a cursory treatment of it as part of the whole. The question of dialogue affects every aspect of playwriting and should be given a prominent and separate position in any text.

There are a number of excellent chapters in Professor Gallaway's book. Two which are of particular value to the beginning playwright are entitled "The Course of Action" and "Complications." In both of these chapters Professor Gallaway has developed helpful mechanisms to assist the playwright in the arrangement of his material and in planning the dramatic progression of the necessary elements of action. It should also be noted that the various suggested exercises for the beginning playwright which are scattered throughout the book are stimulating and extremely helpful to the teacher of playwriting as well as to the novice playwright.

There is considerable merit in *Constructing a Play*. It affords the beginning playwright an opportunity to analyze his own weaknesses in light of the errors which Professor Gallaway's students have made. The text also abounds with examples of the successful practices of established playwrights, so that with both types of examples the young playwright has an opportunity to recognize himself in his struggles with a difficult medium and to profit by the experience of mature artists in the theatre. Professor Gallaway has done a satisfactory piece of work in making these two experiences clear and valuable.

PERSUASIVE SPEAKING: By Robert T. Oliver. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., Inc., 1950; pp. ix + 272. \$3.00.

Professor Oliver is already well-known for his writings in the area of persuasive speech. His books in the field of Public Speaking and Communication Skills, and his widely used *Psychology of Persuasive Speech*, will assure his newest book immediate attention—attention which is definitely well deserved. *Persuasive Speaking* is not a revision of *Psychology of Persuasive Speech*, but is a new text designed to help the serious student of public address develop an understanding and skill in an important area of his field. It is introductory in character and is clearly and interestingly written. There is, throughout, an admirable ability to discuss the "How-to's" of persuasion rather than merely its criteria of excellence. The book makes a conscientious effort to use the most recent psychological and sociological knowledge, and where teaching pragmatism makes the rejection of our later knowledge seem wise (e.g. in the Chapter dealing with Persuasion through Emotion), this has been done only in terms of carefully explained reasons. (Rationalization, as Professor Oliver interprets it, can be and often is a positive process!)

The opening sentence is an arresting clue to the vitality of Professor Oliver's approach, as well as to the functional importance of his subject: "Persuasion is influence." (page 1) Lest there be fear as to the ethical basis of the subject, and the educational justification for teaching it, three other sentences will bear quoting: "The truly persuasive individuals are those who represent in their own characters and personalities the best traits of the society in which they live. . . . He who would master the art of persuasive speech must first of all master himself. For his influence will depend upon all that he is, in word, in thought, and in deed." (pp. 3-4) The author, in other words, is no Sophist.

At the end of each chapter are a concluding summary, a set of exercises, and a selected bibliography of additional readings. There are three fascinating appendices: *Brief Specimens and Critiques of Persuasion*; *Case Studies in Persuasive Speech*; and *Elements of Persuasive Personality*. There is also an excellent index. The book is well planned; well written; conservative and eclectic, but sound in its over-all approach. It should prove to be widely useful in courses in Persuasion, Argumentation, or Debate. Any teacher of Public Speaking would do well to read it carefully, and make use of the suggestive materials which Professor Oliver, from his wide background of scholarship, has synthesized for us. Persuasion need not be a step-sister to elocution, or a glib and skillful ability to "make the worse appear the better cause."

DONALD H. ECROYD

University of Alabama

CONFEDERATE LEADERS IN THE NEW SOUTH: By William Best Hesselstine. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1950; pp. xi + 147; \$2.50.

Those interested in the history of Southern public address will welcome this volume as a stimulant to new research in an era which has often been neglected.



In *Confederate Leaders in the New South*, Professor William Best Hesselstine, a distinguished authority on Southern history, surveys the careers of 656 top-ranking civil and military leaders of the Confederate States of America as they turned their talents to the tasks of reconstruction. Because of his detailed research, Dr. Hesselstine is able to give a significant answer to the question, "What happened to the leaders of the Confederacy?"

Of the 656 important Confederate officials who lived long enough to make postwar adjustments, only seventy-one "failed to recover a substantial portion of the position and prestige they had enjoyed during the Confederacy's peak." The remaining 585 distinguished themselves in a variety of postwar pursuits and played important roles in building a new South. Perhaps it is not surprising that after Radical Reconstruction many were restored to political office. One served as a justice of the United States Supreme Court; two were appointed to the Cabinet; twenty-two entered the diplomatic corps; thirty became governors; twenty-eight were elected to the United States Senate and forty-five to Congress; there were twenty-nine state senators, forty-four assemblymen, thirty-five judges, fourteen state supreme court justices, twelve state chief justices, eight attorney generals, and numerous elected state officials. Those who chose to enter business, education, and the ministry were also restored to prominence. "Their successful economic and political rehabilitation," says Dr. Hesselstine, "bore tribute to the aggressiveness and to the resiliency of the Confederacy's sometime leading men."

Among the group were many colorful personalities worthy of the attention of the rhetorical critic: Brigadier General Mark P. Lowrey, for example, founder of Blue Mountain Female Institute, and famed for oratorical exploits thoroughly in accord with his motto, "Preach like Hell on Sunday and fight like the Devil all week"; the self-appointed South Carolina "Ambassador of Good Will to the North," Patrick K. Lynch, Catholic Bishop of Charleston, "a preacher whose Irish tongue easily scaled the heights of traditional Southern oratory"; Senator George Vest of Missouri, perhaps best known for his celebrated tribute to "Man's Best Friend, the Dog"; Brigadier General Edward Porter Alexander, a vigorous spokesman of social Darwinism who proclaimed that the War was merely "nature's way" of cementing the bonds of nationality in blood. And so on, down the list of the 585, many of whom deserve more than a casual listing: Bishop Charles Quintard whose energies built the University of the South; Postmaster General John H. Reagan of Texas; railroad builders John Calvin Brown and Thomas M. Logan; industrialist Thomas Taylor Munford; preachers Moses Drury Hodge, Albert Taylor Bledsoe, Robert Louis Dabney, and William Nelson Pendleton.

Originally presented as "The Walter Lynwood Fleming Lectures in Southern History" at Louisiana State University, *Confederate Leaders in the New South* has the virtue of being interesting, as well as scholarly. Its statistics are presented effectively, and well-selected quotations from contemporary sources enliven the text. It is to be regretted that there is no index or bibliography to assist those rhetoricians who may wish to question Dr. Hesselstine's conclusion that Confederate leaders often distilled "a heady oratory and a flamboyant style from their battle experiences."

FIFTY FABULOUS YEARS, 1900-1950, A PERSONAL REVIEW: By H. V. Kaltenborn.  
New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1950; pp. viii + 312. \$3.50.

There seems little hope that progress of the radio and television media toward maturity will be much helped by external pressures alone. Codes and fiats tend to be self-defeating. The NAB and Motion Picture Production codes seem typical, leading ultimately either to tacit wholesale evasion or to a mean-spirited literal enforcement and consequent degradation of artistic expression. The hope lies rather in the personal influence of individual performers, directors, and executives whose own integrity not only insures a good standard in the programs over which they have direct control, but also sets standards for others to follow. It is something to be able to point to a conspicuous example and to say, "There! You see, it *can* be done."

H. V. Kaltenborn is such an example. He has probably done more than any other man to dignify and to elevate the profession of radio news commentator, essentially because he has consistently regarded the job as a professional one. First and foremost, he brought the working newspaperman's traditional concept of freedom of expression to radio, and that in a day when radio had no tradition of its own on which to rely. Fortunately, Mr. Kaltenborn was in the early days of his radio career primarily a member of the Brooklyn *Daily Eagle* staff, only secondarily a radio commentator. This double affiliation served him in good stead while radio, unsure of its prerogatives and duties, was excessively timid. He adopted the view that when he spoke on the air he was still bound by the same obligations and protected by the same traditions as when he wrote a newspaper editorial. When stations and sponsors failed to back him up, he had the newspaper to fall back on, not only as a source of steady income, but also as a means of stiffening the backs of doubtful radio executives. Mr. Kaltenborn's experiences with WEAf in its carbon-microphone days while the Telephone Company was still playing at broadcasting well illustrate the point. Each week the intransigent commentator from Brooklyn probed some new hypersensitive spot on the far-flung public-relations front of AT&T. Only the threat of opening a new front in the columns of the *Daily Eagle* saved him from summary dismissal. One can understand what a sigh of relief must have risen from the Telephone Company's phalanx of wire-conscious vice-presidents when its broadcasting interests were sold to RCA in 1926.

*Fifty Fabulous Years* is not, however, primarily a record of Mr. Kaltenborn's radio experience. Primarily it is, as the subtitle states, a "personal review" of the past fifty years, a recapitulation of surface events in terms mainly of the men who shaped them. Secondarily it is a personal biography — not an intimate self-revelation, but a record of the public activities of a public figure. Only incidentally, as part of the larger story, does Mr. Kaltenborn comment on the professional details of his career as a radio commentator. Despite these limitations in scope, *Fifty Fabulous Years* does have some of the dramatic interest of the traditional American Horatio Alger story — from the relatively humble and obscure beginnings in Merrill, Wisconsin; through the youthful struggles in the big city (in this instance, never too melodramatic); and on to glamorous success in a chosen career. The history lesson is thrown in free. Indirectly, we

get as well a feeling for the author's remarkable vitality, his essential conservatism of outlook, and his firm belief in radio's share in freedom of the press.

Mr. Kaltenborn has consistently demanded recognition for the professional character of his work, fought commercial practices and station policies which tend to demean the news commentator's status or limit his personal freedom. He founded the Association of Radio News Analysts, whose members hold out against the middle commercial in news shows and against voicing of the commercial announcements by the commentator. Before precedent was established, he lost many a job because of his intransigence. In this connection he pays tribute to WOR, which backed him up despite such strong pressures as the threat of exclusion from all municipal events in New York.

Students of broadcasting will find most interesting Mr. Kaltenborn's recollections of how he brought the first "spoken editorials" to radio; of the conditions under which broadcasters operated in the early 1920's; of the memorable "twenty days" in which he made radio history with 102 broadcasts covering the Munich Crisis; of Paul White's attempt to purge CBS of news opinion. Mr. Kaltenborn concludes his section on the early days of broadcasting by saying, "someday I may try to write a book on the history and progress of free speech on the air." Such a book would be a real service. Few men have had his opportunity to participate daily in the evolution of broadcasting on a high level from pre-network days down to the days of television. Much of historical importance that he can tell us has doubtless never been put on paper. He and the other members of his own "Twenty Year Club," which he founded in 1942, have an obligation to preserve for us the story of the pioneering days of radio as an editorial medium.

SYDNEY W. HEAD

*University of Miami*

SCENERY DESIGNS FOR THE AMATEUR STAGE: By Willard J. Friederich and John H. Fraser. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950; pp. xvii + 262; \$3.75.

At last a book has appeared which offers immediate, practical help to that overworked, harried artist-by-training-or-accident, the average designer in the amateur theatre. He it is who must quickly, expediently, and economically make silk purses out of sows' ears on space no larger than a postage stamp without benefit of a scene shop full of mechanical wonders. Many excellent manuals detailing methods and materials of stage scenery construction have been available for as long as twenty years. This is the first American text, however, which attempts to meet the need of an elementary course in scene design. Its authors assume an elementary acquaintanceship with basic stage processes and terminologies. Written by a theatre director and a professor of art at a small liberal arts college, Marietta, the chief virtue of the study is its simple recognition that ninety-nine of one hundred scene designers in this country are ill housed in their theatre plants. It accepts as basic the premise that most de-

signers in the non-commercial theatre shudder as they contemplate their present stage houses. But wisely the book regards the typical poorly planned theatre or auditorium as merely a slight obstacle which must and can be hurdled in a constant endeavor to achieve art with economy.

Especially noteworthy is the authors' treatment of line, color, and mass, together with principles of design. Here, properly, in a text for scenery design is accessible basic knowledge which can easily be understood by that theatre student who, like most of them, wanders into the designer's drafting room from the stage door instead of entering from the atelier. In their treatment the grandiose in artistic conception is always conditioned by practical knowledge of the stage house limitations. The chapters on making the necessary drawings for stage design are clearly written with excellent pedagogical progression and include many interesting and valuable exercises planned for the student.

Wisely the authors begin their study of design with the demands of the script. The treatment of style is necessarily cursory; most theatre students will need a more thorough survey from other sources. An occasional comment seems artistically questionable, as when they discuss the style of backdrop painting used for the Broadway musical *Up in Central Park*: "Thus, even though it harmonized perfectly with the spirit of the script it became *just* [italics mine] a theatrical background for the action. . . ." The customary confusion by the Age-of-Realism student of scenery as environment and scenery as background for acting becomes thus needlessly extended. Including as a final chapter a brief treatment of "Design through the Ages" was an excellent idea; it is to be hoped that in a later edition the authors can supplement this material with bibliographical guides of books and plates on the various periods for the student designer.

Appendices include a brief general bibliography, a list of terms for the untrained reader, and a guide of theatrical equipment houses. By and large, Friederich and Fraser have written a textbook which does not duplicate previous materials available within the covers of one book for the college instructor and have presented it simply and clearly. Students in the basic design class here at Stanford, where the reviewer is presently teaching, unanimously praise the book.

ROBERT DIERLAM

*University of Florida*

A TRAINING COURSE IN EFFECTIVE SPEAKING: By Paul M. Stokes and Gray L. Carpenter. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, in association with *Modern Industry* magazine, 1950; \$29.50.

Contains: Vol. 1 of text (foreword i-v) (pp. 1-96), vol. 2 of text (pp. 97-190 and index), Funk and Wagnall's *New Desk Standard Dictionary*, and 7 10-inch, non-breakable records.

As is suggested by the authors' preface, this training kit might be most effectively used in connection with business men's groups and in-plant training ses-

sions. It is aimed at producing quick results in its students with a highly mechanistic approach, concerned with the techniques and "tricks" of effective speaking: how and when—not why, to what purpose, from what motives, or for what effect. It is also, therefore, more suited to a voice and diction course than to any fundamentals of speech course in a university or high school.

Composed of extremely high fidelity records, which contain 57 examples of speech techniques to be played at specified intervals during the course; two nicely composed volumes of the text; and a copy of Funk & Wagnalls' *New Desk Standard Dictionary*, the kit is easily portable, durable, and neat looking.

The advantages of the kit are obvious to those convinced of the value of visual and auditory aids to education. Its disadvantages, however, far outweigh its advantages.

First, the records, while they have been well done by a trained radio actor, illustrate one of the more disagreeable features of much recorded and radio speech; they are impersonal and lack the directness and person-to-person communicative quality most public speaking teachers try to instill in their students. More important, the chief purpose of their inclusion in the kit seems to have been (according to the text) for imitation by the student. How much the student can learn and retain by the method of imitation is questionable, although the authors tell in their foreword of outstanding results brought about by this training method.

Second, the dictionary cannot be recommended as a pronunciation text, because it omits pronunciation guides on words thought by its authors to be obvious; out of 40 words listed on a page chosen at random by the reviewer, 27 had no pronunciation guides other than primary accent markings, and of those, only 6 or 7 could be said to be in the average American's speaking vocabulary.

The text itself, however, is its own best argument against its adoption by colleges and high schools in basic speech or public speaking courses. The authors have deliberately stayed clear of any discussion of logical thinking, motives, or sincerity (except the simulation of sincerity to gain acceptance). Indeed, in the chapter on "Attitudes Behind Speech," the primary concern of the text is with the attitudes the audience can detect, and therefore, in the art of "pretending": of acting with body, voice, and face the attitude the speaker hopes the audience will assume he holds. Later in the book the authors turn a discussion of sound ideas in speaking into a discussion of audience acceptance, and logical progression is urged only as a good way to hold audience attention. Under the subject of organizing a speech, the authors discuss choosing a topic before they discuss setting the objectives of the speech. The implication, then, suggests a superficial motivation in speaking.

The text includes no discussion of the idea of direct communication, except as a speaker's trick to gain attention. The authors, however, recognize their manual for what it is; they make no attempt to recommend it as an ideal college text. Their examples of the practical applications of the techniques as taught include the sales talk, the business conference, the law court, conventions and professional meetings, reports to superiors, classroom and public lectures, and informal conversations. (The latter example, by the way, is one of the

few poorly illustrated points on the records, and is open to severe criticism.)

A few errors occur in the text and illustrations. For example, one reading exercise attributes the last two lines of Keats' *Ode on a Grecian Urn* to Shelley, compliments Shelley on his talent, as displayed by those lines, and concludes: "of course there were other poets of the era, too. Byron and Keats didn't do badly either."

And shortly after emphasizing the need for good pronunciation, the speaker on the record mispronounces "Secretary" as "SEK-UH-TERRY." On a later record "we're" is pronounced "WARE."

The cost of the set — \$29.50 — while not out of reach for most schools, is high enough to make careful consideration necessary before putting out such a sum.

CORRINE HOLT RICKERT

University of Florida

TEACHING YOUR CHILD TO TALK: By C. Van Riper. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950; pp. 141; \$2.00.

As the title implies, *Teaching Your Child To Talk* is a book written for parents. Much has been written for parents to guide them in teaching proper feeding and toilet habits, but speech acquisition has been developed largely by the "bang and blunder" method. Therefore, it is small wonder that "there are more people handicapped by stuttering, lisping, lalling and unpleasant voices than all the deaf, blind, crippled and feeble-minded put together."

Mr. Van Riper has practically guaranteed that the entire book will be read by all who start it. The style is highly entertaining and the personal experiences and catchy phrases make pleasant reading for the childless as well as the parent.

The first six chapters describe the normal development of speech from the birth cry and howling stage, through the babbling, comprehension, and imitation stages to "The Child's First Words." Methods are outlined for aiding the child in acquiring speech. "We hold no brief for pushing a child in speech in any way. You can't help an onion grow by pulling its top! But you can make it grow faster and healthier by preparing the soil and cultivating it intelligently." Informed parents can enjoy each stage of their child's speech development, even the howling stage. They can anticipate and recognize each phase as it appears, thus enabling them to give aid and encouragement at the time when it is needed most. When the favorable period of speech development has passed, speech subsequently develops more slowly and less easily than when it is begun earlier.

Chapters seven, "Collecting Tools"; nine, "Becoming Fluent"; eleven, "Growing Up Verbally"; and twelve, "Between Speech" or adolescent speech, continue the description of the child's speech development. Some suggestions for aid in this development are given, but the anxious parent might wish for even more specific suggestions.

"Of three million or more speech defectives in this country alone, all but a few have the origin of their handicaps in the development of speech itself."

Chapters eight, "Baby Talk," and ten, "Tangled Tongues," give some very practical suggestions for preventing speech difficulties which might become permanent defects.

*Teaching Your Child To Talk* is not only an entertaining and helpful book for parents but a good one for classroom teachers and the speech correctionist who daily must answer the question of parents, "What can I do to help my child with his speech problems?"

MARGARET F. PERRITT

*Alachua County Public Schools*  
*Gainesville, Florida*

RADIO, TELEVISION, AND SOCIETY: By Charles A. Siepmann. New York: Oxford University Press, 1950; pp. vii + 410; \$4.75.

Every now and then a book is published that can be recommended without reservation to the specialists in a particular field. It is interesting to note that while Charles A. Siepmann's *Radio, Television, and Society* is such a book, reviewers who's interests range from the social consequences of the media to the financial aspects of the mass communication industries, are recommending it.

Siepmann's book is divided into two parts. Part one deals with the history of broadcasting and the various systems of broadcasting in operation throughout the world. Part two deals with the social implications of radio and television.

Part one begins with a lively discussion of the early history of radio from the beginning through the formation of the Communications Act. This section is followed by a clear analysis of the radio industry and what it has become today. After discussing radio and society generally, Mr. Siepmann turns his attention to the listeners rights and duties. The last chapter in part one of the book presents objectively the British, the Canadian, and other systems of broadcasting in the world.

The second half of the book, part two, deals with the social implications and significance of radio and television in terms of the historical and contemporary analysis in part one. This second section discusses the media in terms of its effect upon society in a chapter called, "Propaganda and Public Opinion." In this chapter the author discusses radio as a medium especially adapted for conducting a struggle using conflicting opinion as tactics in a battle for the control of men's minds. The two chapters, "Freedom of Speech in Theory," and "Freedom of Speech in Practice," contain ideas which should be considered carefully by those who spin platters and turn dials.

Mr. Siepmann's discussion of radio and television as media of public enlightenment and the purpose of that enlightenment is fundamental. Radio, he points out, either as a program medium or as an advertising medium, is basically propaganda. Furthermore, it is a one-way medium because it does not permit even the most ardent radio and TV listener to talk back.

In his constructive suggestions, Mr. Siepmann feels that we could make bet-

ter use of the facilities we possess by becoming aware of the dangers of organized persuasion. He feels radio and television should be utilized as a cultural and educational media not only in this country but throughout the world.

*Radio, Television, and Society* is a challenging book that should be studied by every radio major and read by everyone interested in mass communications. There are excerpts from the Communications Act and the Federal Communications Commission's rulings for understanding the duties of this agency in relation to the radio industry. The book has an adequate index plus an appendix suggesting projects and sources for further research and study.

J. CLARK WEAVER

*University of Florida*



## NEWS AND NOTES

In the fall of 1951, the departments of Speech and Drama, at the University of Georgia, will be combined into the Department of Speech and Drama, under the department chairman, Leighton M. Ballew.

Dr. Sara Stinchfield Hawk will be a member of the summer staff of the Davison School of Speech Correction.

The Speech and Hearing section of the Divisions of Speech Arts, at Mississippi Southern College, Hattiesburg, is cooperating with the Mississippi School for the Deaf, School for the Blind, and State Health Department in examination and Remediation of cases.

The Gulf Speech Festival was held at Mississippi Southern College in February and an invitational Speech Festival for Junior Colleges in March.

Empress Y. Zedler and four student clinicians from Southwest Texas State Teachers College, presented lectures and demonstrations of speech therapy in a seminar meeting of resident physicians and student pediatricians at the School of Pediatrics, Medical Branch, University of Texas, Galveston.

Sue Craig, formerly at Paine College, Augusta, Georgia, is supervisor of graduate students in the Speech Clinic at the University of Virginia.

The speech department at Bob Jones University, Greenville, South Carolina, includes the departments of interpretative speech, public speaking, dramatic production, radio, speech education and the speech clinic.

The radio department under the direction of Robert Pratt offers two majors in radio: radio speech and radio production. The University has its own 1000 watt radio station which began operation in the fall of 1949. It also has a completely equipped cinema department. The radio and cinema studios give valuable training and experience to the speech students.

Virginia Bell is a new member of the speech staff at Belhaven College, Jackson, Mississippi.

The expanded program in Speech Improvement at Shorter College includes a survey of all Freshmen students. A laboratory follow-up is being conducted by member of the Speech Correction Classes under the direction of Mrs. Allie Hays Richardson.

Albert Martin, Speech Department, Dartmouth College, is developing an album of Reading by teachers of interpretation. Those who have contributed to

the album are Sara Lowrey, Furman University; W. B. McCoard, University of Southern California; Harriet Grim, University of Wisconsin; Charlotte Lee and Robert Breen, Northwestern. Anyone interested in the album should contact Albert Martin, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.

William Dibrell, graduate of Southwest Texas State Teachers College, San Marcos, has been assigned by the U. S. Army as a speech therapist at Walter Reed Hospital.

Edgar Shelton, debate coach at the University of Texas, has resigned to become a member of Senator Johnson's committee in Washington, D. C.

The University of Tennessee inaugurated a touring season this year playing *Our Town* in a number of communities throughout the eastern part of the state.

The University of Tennessee Debating Team has been active in tournaments at the University of Florida, Alabama and University of the South.

Roberta Morrill, St. Petersburg Junior College, has completed her Master's degree at the University of Florida.

The annual conference and play festival of the Southern Association of Dramatic and Speech Arts will be held at the State College for Negroes, Montgomery, Ala., May 3-5.

William H. Row, head of English Department at West Georgia College, Carrollton, has been promoted to Dean of Administration and Instruction.

Tennessee Tech was host to the Tennessee Intercollegiate Forensic Association Tournament in February. Herman Pinkerton served as tournament director.

John B. Stetson University has purchased the local radio station in DeLand, Fla. Clarence L. Menser, a former Vice President of N.B.C. has joined the staff as Director of Radio and Professor of Speech.

Dr. Charles N. Sharpe is now teaching at Tennessee Tech. Dr. Sharpe received his training at Princeton.

Dr. Stanley Ainsworth, Florida State University, director of clinical services of Speech and Hearing clinic was made vice-president-elect of the American Speech and Hearing Association at the Annual Convention held in Columbus, Ohio.

The third annual Florida Conference on Services to Crippled Children was held on the Florida State University campus in March. Featured speakers were,

Drs. Clarence T. Simon, Charles Van Riper, Herbert Cooper, Wendell Johnson, Harriet Gillette, Eugene McDonald, S. Richard Silverman, Leslie B. Holman and Spenser Brown.

The Deep South Debate Conference, formed last year to aid the members schools in training first and second-year debaters, met at Auburn, February 11-12. Five schools — University of Alabama, Mississippi State College for Women, Alabama College at Montevallo, University of Mississippi, and Auburn — engaged in four rounds of debate on the national question. Critiques and lectures were given by the visiting coaches.

The Fourth Annual Auburn Intramural Debate Tournament was held February 20-26. The groupings included sorority, fraternity, and independent divisions; and the question for debate was "Resolved: That all young men upon reaching the age of eighteen should serve two years in the military service."

Adrian Sayre Harris has been appointed instructor in Speech and Art and Director of the University Theatre at the University of Alabama in place of William Kinzer, who resigned for professional theatre work in New York. Mr. Harris received his M.A. degree at the University of Iowa and has been Technical Director at the University of Maryland for the past two years. He was Designer and Technical Director of the Washington Susquicentennial pageant "*Faith of our Fathers*."

Miss Jane Beasley has been appointed Assistant Professor of Speech at the University of Alabama and will be in charge of the Children's Clinic. Miss Beasley was formerly associated with Dr. Ollie Backus at the University of Michigan and was at Ohio University last year.

Albert Bienert has resigned from his position at the University of Alabama and has entered the Hearing Aid business, having been appointed the representative of a leading hearing aid. He will continue to reside in Tuscaloosa.

The Junior League School of Speech Correction, Atlanta, has recently organized a cleft palate clinic. On the consultant staff are two plastic surgeons, a pediatrician, an otologist, an orthodontist, dentist, speech pathologist and psychologist. The purpose of the clinic is to coordinate the services needed for cleft palate persons in order that the total needs may be determined and met. Chairmen are Miss Mary Rose Costello and Dr. Frank Kanthac.

Richard Korn, graduate of the University of North Carolina, is a new member of the speech staff at Brenau College, Gainesville, Ga.

Miss Lois Gregg Secor, who is especially interested in interpretation and monoacting, will complete the cycle of artistic presentations at Brenau College with recitals.

Arthur Fleser, Asbury College, Wilmore, Kentucky, received his M.A. degree in speech at the University of Iowa last summer.

Interest in Radio broadcasting has increased at Alabama Polytechnical Institute, to the extent of doubling the enrollment in Radio Workshop. A campus newscast and thirty minute dramas, under the direction of Richard F. Yoo, are broadcast over the local station.

Dr. Robert Dierlam, University of Florida, is on leave the second semester and for the summer, teaching at Stanford University. Two other members of the Florida faculty will teach in other institutions during the summer. Dr. Dallas C. Dickey will teach at Duke, and Professor H. P. Constans at the University of Maine. On the way to Maine, Professor Constans will stop at the University of New Hampshire to conduct a two day short course in high school forensics.

### S.A.A. PLAYS

University of Georgia — Dir. Leighton Ballew

*The Winslow Boy*

Mississippi Southern College — Dir. John Mullin

*Blythe Spirit*

Southwest Texas State Teachers College — Dirs. J. G. Barton, Jo Bennett

*Black Chiffon, Sleeping Beauty, There Shall Be No Night*

Louisiana Polytechnic Institute — Dir. Vera A. Paul

*Double Door, Harvey, She Stoops to Conquer*

Vanderbilt University — Dir. Joseph Wright

*Much Ado About Nothing*

Delta State College — Dir. Ruth M. Williams

*Arsenic and Old Lace*

Central High School — Jackson, Miss. Dir. Emmy Lou Patton

*Passing of the Third Floor Back*

One-act plays: *The Wonder Hat, The Robbery, Where the Cross Is Made, Suppressed Desires, These Doggone Elections.*

University of Tennessee — Dir. Paul S. Soper

*Born Yesterday, Journey's End, Winterset, The Women*

Converse College — Dir. Hazel Abbott

*Madwoman of Chaillot, King Lear*, music composed by dean of music school

Barry College — Miami, Fla. Dir. Sister M. Trinita

*The Tidings Brought Mary, Mary of Scotland*

Pensacola High School — Dir. Jeannette Garner

*We Shook the Family Tree, The Perfect Idiot, One Foot in Heaven*

Clemson Little Theatre — Dirs. R. E. Ware, James P. Winter

*Berkley Square, Hay Fever*

St. Petersburg Junior College — Dir. Roberta Morrill

*Kind Lady*

Fisk University — Dir. Lillian W. Voorhees

*Twelfth Night, The Respectful Prostitute, Shewing-Up of Blanco Posnet*

William and Mary Theatre — Dir. Howard M. Scammon, Jr.

*Winter's Tale, The Sea Gull*

Brenau College — Gainesville, Ga. Dir. Richard Korn

*Watch on the Rhine, Alice in Wonderland, Berkeley Square:*

Dir. Mrs. La Fleur

David Lipscomb College — Dir. Ora Crabtree

*Eastward in Eden, Candida, Importance of Being Earnest,*

*Pharaoh's Daughter*

Asburg College — Dirs. Arthur Fleser, Mrs. Gladys Greathouse

*Our Town, Cheaper By the Dozen*

Shorter College — Dir. Anne Whipple

*Goodby My Fancy, Seven Sisters, The Heiress*

Bob Jones University

*The Tempest, Faust* with guest Metropolitan stars

Woodlawn High School — Dir. Rose B. Johnson

*Life With Father*

Washington Seminary — Atlanta, Ga. Dir. Ruth Draper

*The Great Big Doorstep*

Georgia State College for Women — Dirs. Edna West, Jack Gore

*Right You Are, Cheaper By the Dozen*

Tennessee A and I State College — Nashville, Tenn. Dir. Thomas E. Poag

*A Murder Has Been Arranged, Cabochio, John Loves Mary, Medea*

Alabama College — Dirs. Willilee R. Trumbauer, Walter H. Trumbauer

*Lady Precious Stream, The Tempest, The Skin of Our Teeth*

University of Houston

*Happy Birthday, Kitty Doon, The Merchant of Venice, Family Portrait,*

*Beyond the Horizon, The Late George Apley, The Skin of Our Teeth*

Stetson University — Dir. Irving C. Stover

*The Mollusc, The Heiress, Romeo and Juliet*

# INDEX

## THE SOUTHERN SPEECH JOURNAL

### VOLUME XVI

A Proceedings Report Of The Twentieth Annual Convention .....	85- 97
Abel, James W., "About The Pronunciation Of Six Freshmen From Southern University" .....	259-267
Anderson, Thomas B., and Black, Jown W., "An Experimental Study Of The Evaluation Of Hearing Aids" .....	278-280
Auer, J. Jeffery, "A Northern Whig And The Southern Cause" .....	15- 39
Bagley, Russell E., "Theatrical Entertainment In Pensacola, Florida: 1882-1892" .....	62- 84
Baker, Virgil, "Albert Pike: Citizen Speechmaker Of Arkansas" .....	179-197
Baird, A. Craig (ed.) <i>Representative American Speeches:</i> 1949-1950, revd. ....	237-238
Barnlund, Dean C., 113-115, revs., McBurney, James H., and Hance, Kenneth G., <i>Discussion In Human Affairs</i> .....	1-432
Baxter, Batsell B., "Attention Forensic Coaches" .....	106
Baxter, Batsell B., "Improved Tournament In Prospect" .....	230-231
Blackwell, Thomas B., and Villarreal, Jesse J., "Projective Tests In Planning Therapy For Stutterers" .....	251-258
Brandes, Paul D., "The Mississippi Youth Congress" .....	40- 49
Brinegar, Haywood C., 239, revs. Ross, Russell Conwell, <i>Speak With Ease</i> .....	1-118
Bryngelson, Bryng, "The Classroom Teacher Testing For Speech Defects" .....	214-217
Capp, Glenn R., "The 1950 National Questions Committee" .....	152-154
Chester, Giraud, and Garrison, Garnet R., <i>Radio And Television: An Introduction</i> , revd. ....	233-235
Coffman, Ruth, 162-164, revs. Manser, Ruth, and Finlan, Leonard, <i>The Speaking Voice</i> .....	1-404
Cox, Frances, 112-113, revs. Ommanney, Katherine Anne, and Ommanney, Pierce C., <i>The Stage Is Set</i> .....	1-571
Cromwell, Harvey, "An Experimental Design For Determining Induced Changes In The Attitudes Of Others" .....	198-206
Davison, Louise D., "Follow-Up Of Four Aphasic Children" .....	50- 61
Dierlam, Robert, 287-288, revs. Friederich, Willard J., and Fraser, John W., <i>Scenery Design For The Amateur Stage</i> .....	1-262
Dierlam, Robert, 111-112, revs. Gassner, John (ed.), <i>A Treasury Of The Theatre: From Henrik Ibsen To Arthur Miller</i> .....	111-112
Donaldson, Alice, "Public Address In Missouri: 1904" .....	117-132
Downer, Alan S., <i>The British Drama: A Handbook And Brief Chronicle</i> , revd. ....	161-162
Drake, Francis E., "How Do You Teach Listening?" .....	268-271
Dusenbury, Delwin B., 109-110, revs. Simonson, Lee, <i>The Art Of Scenic Design</i> .....	1-174

Ecroyd, Donald H., 284, revs. Oliver, Robert T., <i>Persuasive Speaking</i> ....	1-272
Ecroyd, Donald H., 166-167, revs. Summers, Harrison Boyd, Whan, Forrest Livings, and Roussee, Thomas Andrew, <i>How To Debates: A Textbook For Beginners</i> .....	1-349
Edney, Clarence, "A Working System Of Ideas" .....	145-151
Ehninger, Douglas, 237-238, revs. Baird, A. Craig (ed.), <i>Representative American Speeches: 1949-1950</i> .....	1-264
Eubank, Wayne C., 164-165, revs. Wagner, Russell H., and Arnold. Carroll C., <i>Handbook Of Group Discussion</i> .....	1-315
Eubanks, Ralph T., 168-170, revs. Zelko, Harold P., <i>How To Become A Successful Speaker</i> .....	1-160
Financial Statement: Southern Speech Association .....	103-105
Friederich, Willard J., and Fraser, John W., <i>Scenery Designs For The Amateur Stage</i> , revd. ....	287-288
Gallaway, Marian, <i>Constructing A Play</i> , revd. ....	282-283
Gassner, John (ed.), <i>A Treasury Of The Theatre: From Henrik Ibsen To Arthur Miller</i> , revd. ....	111-112
Getchell, Charles Munro, "Southern Graduate Study In Speech And Theatre: 1950" .....	218-227
Glasgow, George M., <i>Dynamic Public Speaking</i> , revd. ....	167
Gould, Samuel B., and Diamond, Sidney A., <i>Training The Local Announcer</i> , revd. ....	168
Graham, Kenneth L., 236-237, revs. Ward, Winifred, <i>Theatre For Children</i> .....	1-312
Gunderson, Robert Gray, 284-285, revs. Hesseltine, William Best, <i>Confederate Leaders In The New South</i> .....	1-147
Gunderson, Robert Gray, "The Magnanimous Mr. Clay" .....	133-144
Hagood, Annabel Dunham, 239-240, revs. Marx, Herbert L. (ed.), <i>The Welfare State</i> .....	1-212
Hagood, Annabel Dunham, "The American Forensic Association In The South" .....	228-229
Hardin, Ernest R., "Fundamental Needs For Interpretative Attainment" ..	141-144
Harwood, Kenneth, 168, revs. Gould, Samuel B., and Dimond, Sidney A., <i>Training The Local Announcer</i> .....	1-201
Hawk, Sara Stinchfield, <i>Speech Therapy For The Physically Handicapped</i> , revd. ....	232-233
Head, Sidney W., 286-287, revs. Kaltenborn, H. V., <i>Fifty Fabulous Years, 1900-1950, A Personal Review</i> .....	1-312
Heffron, Pearl, and Duffey, William R., <i>Teaching Speech: Methods And Aims In The Study Of Speech</i> , revd. ....	165-166
Hesseltine, William Best, <i>Confederate Leaders In The New South</i> , revd. ....	284-285
Johnson, Albert E., 161-162, revs. Downer, Alan S., <i>The British Drama: A Handbook and Brief Chronicle</i> .....	1-397
Johnson, T. Earle, 115-116, revs. Needleman, Morris, H., <i>A Manual Of Pronunciation</i> .....	1-323

Kaltenborn, H. V., <i>Fifty Fabulous Years, 1900-1950,</i> <i>A Personal Review</i> , revd. ....	286-287
Kincaid, Robert L., "Abraham Lincoln: The Speaker" .....	241-250
Lewis, Thomas R., 165-166, revs. Heffron, Pearl, and Duffy, William R., <i>Teaching Speech: Methods And Aims In The Study Of Speech</i> .....	1-290
McBurney, James H., and Hance, Kenneth G., <i>Discussion In Human Affairs</i> , revd. ....	113-115
Manser, Ruth B., and Finlan, Leonard, <i>The Speaking Voice</i> , revd. ....	162-164
Marx, Herbert L. (ed.), <i>The Welfare State</i> , revd. ....	239-240
Mase, Darrel J., 232-233, revs. Hawk, Sara Stinchfield, <i>Speech Therapy For The Physically Handicapped</i> .....	1-245
Mawhinney, Clara Kreifting, and Smith, Harley A., <i>Business And Professional Speech</i> , revd. ....	238-239
Minutes, The Southern Speech Association, Twentieth Annual Convention .....	98-102
Needleman, Morriss H., <i>A Manual Of Pronunciation</i> , revd. ....	115-116
Newman, John B., "Mid-Century Speech Conference" .....	107-108
Oliver, Robert T., <i>Persuasive Speaking</i> , revd. ....	284
Oliver, Robert T., "Role Of Speech In Diplomacy" .....	207-213
Ommanney, Katherine Anne, and Ommanney, Pierce C., <i>The Stage Is Set</i> , revd. ....	112-113
Perritt, Margaret F., 290-291, revs. Van Riper, C., <i>Teaching Your Child To Talk</i> .....	1-141
Philbrick, Norman, 282-283, revs. Gallaway, Marian, <i>Constructing A Play</i> .....	1-380
Rahskopf, Horace G., "New Trails and Familiar Landmarks" .....	1- 14
Rickert, Corrine Holt, 288-290, revs. Stokes, Paul M., and Carpenter, Gray L., <i>A Training Course In Effective Speaking</i> .....	
Rickert, Robert T., 167, revs. Glasgow, George M., <i>Dynamic Public Speaking</i> .....	1-315
Ross, Russell Conwell, <i>Speak With Ease</i> , revd. ....	239
Shaver, Claude L., "Message From The President" .....	155-156
Siepmann, Charles A., <i>Radio, Television, and Society</i> , revd. ....	291-292
Simonson, Lee, <i>The Art Of Scenic Design</i> , revd. ....	109-110
Stigers, M. F., <i>Making Conference Programs Work</i> , revd. ....	235-236
Stokes, Paul M., and Carpenter, Gray L., <i>A Training     Course In Effective Speaking</i> , revd. ....	288-290
Summers, Harrison Boyd, Whan, Forest Livings, and Roussee, Thomas Andrew, <i>How To Debate: A Textbook For Beginners</i> , revd. ....	166-167
Van Riper, C., <i>Teaching Your Child To Talk</i> , revd. ....	290-291
Villarreal, Jesse J., and Blackwell, Thomas B., "Projective Tests In Planning Therapy For Stutterers" .....	251-258



Wagner, Russell H., and Arnold, Carroll C., <i>Handbook Of Group Discussion</i> , revd. ....	164-165
Ward, Winifred, <i>Theatre For Children</i> , revd. ....	236-237
Weaver, J. Clark, 291-292, revs. Siepmann, Charles A., <i>Radio, Television, And Society</i> .....	1-410
Weaver, J. Clark, "Radio And The Quality Of Living" .....	272-277
Wertebaker, T. W., Jr., 233-235, revs. Chester, Giraud, and Garrison, Garnet R., <i>Radio And Television: An Introduction</i> .....	1-550
Wetherby, Joseph C., 238-239, revs. Mawhinney, Clara Krefling, and Smith, Harley A., <i>Business And Professional Speech</i> .....	1-222
Zelko, Harold P., <i>How To Become A Successful Speaker</i> , revd. ....	168-170
Zelko, Harold P., 235-236, revs. Stigers, M. F., <i>Making Conference Programs Work</i> .....	1-256



